A

COMMENTARY

ON THE

HOLY SCRIPTURES:

CRITICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND HOMILETICAL,

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MINISTERS AND STUDENTS.

BY

JOHN PETER LANGE, D.D.

IN CONNECTION WITH A NUMBER OF EMINENT EUROPEAN DIVINES.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, AND EDITED, WITH ADDITIONS,

BY

PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.

IN CONNECTION WITH AMERICAN DIVINES OF VARIOUS EVANGELICAL DENOMINATIONS.

VOL. VIII. OF THE NEW TESTAMENT: CONTAINING THE EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS, TIMOTHY, TITUS, PHILEMON, AND THE HEBREWS.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER & CO., 654 BROADWAY.
1870.

THE

TWO EPISTLES OF PAUL

TO THE

THESSALONIANS.

BY

C. A. AUBERLEN, DR. OF PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY, LATE EXTRAORDINARY PROFESSOR IN BASEL.

AND

C. J. RIGGENBACH, DR. OF THEOLOGY, AND PROFESSOR IN ORDINARY IN BASEL.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, WITH ADDITIONS,

BY

JOHN LILLIE, D.D.

FIFTH EDITION.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER & CO., 654 BROADWAY.
1870.

THE TROW & SMITH
BOOK MANUFACTURING COMPANY
46, 48, 50 Greene Street, N. Y.

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

THIS eighth volume of the English edition of Dr. LANGE'S "Bible-Work" contains the exposition of seven Epistles of the New Testament, by the combined labor of ten European and American scholars, as follows:

I. and II. Epistles to the THESSALONIANS. By Drs. AUBERLEN and RIGGENBACH. Translated by Dr. LILLIE.
I. and II. Epistles to TIMOTHY. By Dr. VAN OOSTERZEE. Translated by Drs. WASHBURN and HARWOOD.
Epistle to TITUS. By Dr. VAN OOSTERZEE. Translated by Dr. DAY.
Epistle to PHILEMON. By Dr. VAN OOSTERZEE. Translated by Dr. HACKETT.
Epistle to the HEBREWS. By Dr. MOLL. Translated by Dr. KENDRICK.

These authors and translators represent five countries—Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Scotland,* and the United States; and seven communions—the Evangelical Lutheran, Swiss Reformed, Dutch Reformed, Presbyterian, Protestant Episcopal, Congregational, and Baptist.

The reader may therefore look for a considerable variety of talent and difference of opinion in minor points of doctrine and polity. But in all essential articles of faith, he will find a striking degree of unity—a unity more spiritual and free, and for this very reason more deep and real than the *consensus patrum*, so called, by which the Roman Church would fain prevent or obstruct all further progress in working the inexhaustible mines of revealed truth. Far above all sectarian steeples rises the hill of Zion, where the discords of human creeds are solved in the divine harmony of "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all."

The numerous additions of the translators, from their own researches, and from leading English commentators, will be found to raise the value of the American edition far above the German original.

As general Editor, I wish here publicly to congratulate the translators on the suc

* The late Dr. LILLIE was a Scotchman by birth and education. All the other translators are Americans.

cessful completion of their laborious task, and to express my grateful appreciation of their hearty and efficient co-operation in this noble work. I only regret that one of them—the late lamented Dr. Lillie, like the like-minded Dr. Auberlen—was not permitted to see the volume which owes so much to his accurate scholarship and faithful study.

The Epistles to the Corinthians are nearly ready for the press; as is also the volume on Genesis. The remaining books of the New Testament, excepting the Apocalypse, which has not yet appeared in Germany, are all in course of preparation by able and competent scholars.

PHILIP SCHAFF.

5 Bible House, *New York*, *Feb.* 20, 1868.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE

OF THE

AUTHORS OF THE COMMENTARY ON THE THESSALONIANS.

BY

THE AMERICAN EDITOR.

Charles Augustus Auberlen, to whose competent hands the Commentary on the Epistles to the Thessalonians was first intrusted, and who would have prepared other parts of Lange's *Bibelwerk* (probably the Book of Daniel and the Apocalypse of John), had not a premature death removed him from his earthly labors, was born Nov. 19, 1824, at Fellbach, near Stuttgard, in the kingdom of Württemberg, which for its small size has given rise to an unusual number of distinguished divines, philosophers, and poets. He was educated at Esslingen, Blaubeuren, and at the University of Tübingen, where he stood among the first in his class. For a short time he was in danger of being carried away by the enthusiasm then prevailing among German students for the humanitarianism of Goethe's poetry and Hegel's pantheistic philosophy. But his pious education and associations, the influence of his teachers, Drs. Schmid, Landerer, and Beck, and the diligent study of the Bible and the older Württemberg divines, especially Bengel and Oetinger, guarded him against serious error. After a literary journey through Germany, Holland, and Belgium, and a second residence at Tübingen as *Repetent* (Fellow or Tutor) of the Theological Seminary, he accepted a call as professor extraordinary of theology at the University of Basel in 1851, and was happily married in the same year to a daughter of Dr. Wolfgang Menzel, the well-known author of a History of Germany, a History of German literature (translated into English by the late President Felton of Harvard University), and other works. In 1860 the University of Basel, at its fourth centenary, conferred on him the honorary degree of D. D. In that post he labored with great acceptance and rising fame to his death, May 2, 1864. As his theology, so his departure was full of joyful hope.

Dr. Auberlen was one of the most gifted and promising of the present generation of evangelical divines in Germany, combining thorough learning with devout piety and profound reverence for the Word of God. He had imbibed the spirit of Bengel and Oetinger, but was fully at home in all the modern systems of theology and philosophy. He devoted special attention to the prophetical portions of the Scriptures. Characteristic for his standpoint is the following passage from the preface to the second edition of his work on Daniel: "The elevation on which Scripture places us is one, not merely of the life, but also of knowledge, and to descend from it is likewise to suffer a mighty loss in ideas, especially in the moral sphere. Here that word holds good: 'In Thy light we see light.' . . . Here is a real solution of the problems of life—here a real answer to the questions of existence, so far as one can be given at all for beings, who as yet walk not by sight."

The principal works of Dr. Auberlen, besides a part of the Commentary on the Thessalonians, are the following:

The Theosophy of Friedrich Christoph Oetinger in its leading features. With Preface by Dr. R. Roth (of Heidelberg). Tübingen, 1847.

The Prophet Daniel and the Revelation of John, Basel, 1854; 2d edition revised, 1857. A very superior work, which has been translated into English (for Clark's Foreign Library), and into French. It is not a full commentary, but a comparative exposition of the chief sections of the two books as a basis for a Biblical philosophy of history.

The Divine Revelation, Basel, 2 vols. 1861–64. The second volume, in the preparation of which he died, is unfinished, and was published after his death by Prof. Gess.

Comp. the Biographical Notice in the second volume of Auberlen's work on Revelation, and an article of Dr. Fabri in Herzog's Theol. Encycl., vol. xix. p. 789 sqq.

Dr. C. J. Riggenbach, who completed the Commentary on the Thessalonians after the death of his friend and colleague, is a native of Switzerland, completed his studies at Berlin during 1839–41 (simultaneously with the writer of this notice), and, after laboring as pastor for some time, was elected professor of theology at the University of Basel, where he labors still and enjoys the full confidence of the Christian community. He was once a follower of the Hegelian philosophy, but became a thorough convert to orthodox practical Christianity. He is the author of a valuable work on the Life of Christ, and of several popular lectures against modern infidelity.—P. S.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE OF DR. LILLIE.

It becomes my sad duty, as the general editor of Lange's Commentary, to send out this part of the work with a biographical notice of the translator. A few weeks before his death, Dr. Lillie paid me a visit, in excellent health and spirits, and intrusted to me the manuscript of his translation, after having put to it his last touches in my study. We settled the form of the title page and several matters relating to the final revision. At his request I prepared the biographical notice of my friend Auberlen, who was called hence while engaged in this same Commentary. How little did I dream at that time that I would have so soon to add his own obituary, and to finish his work, as a labor of love to a departed friend and esteemed co-laborer!

The Rev. John Lillie, D.D., was born, December 16, 1812, at Kelso, Scotland, the youngest of a family of six children. He entered the University of Edinburgh in 1828, and was graduated in 1831, with the first honors of his class. During his course he received several prizes, among which was the gold medal given annually by the "Writers to the Signet" to the best Latin scholar. I well remember in what high terms his Latin Professor, James Pillans, to whom he gave me a letter of introduction in 1854, spoke of the classical scholarship, talent, and industry of his former pupil. His Alma Mater publicly recognized his merits, by conferring on him, in 1855, the diploma of Doctor of Divinity.

From 1831 to 1834 he studied theology, taught a classical academy at Edinburgh, and travelled in England.

In August, 1834, he sailed, in company with elder members of his family, for the United States, and completed his theological studies in the Seminary of the Dutch Reformed Church at New Brunswick, N. J. In February, 1836, he was ordained and installed minister of the Reformed Dutch church at Kingston, Dutchess Co., N. Y., where he labored with ability and fidelity till August, 1841, when he was invited to the Presidency of the Grammar School connected with the University of the City of New York. Shortly afterwards he took charge of a church in Stanton street, New York, and edited the *Jewish Chronicle* (from 1844 to 1848) in behalf of missions among the Jews.

In 1852 the "American Bible Union," which was organized in 1850 in the city of New York, engaged his services, and subsequently those of Drs. Conant, Hackett, Kendrick, Rödiger, Forsyth, and other scholars of various denominations, for the difficult work of preparing a new or revised version of the Holy Scriptures. He assisted the Society in collecting for the purpose one of the most complete and valuable exegetical and critical libraries extant, including a rare set of the best editions of the Greek and Latin fathers, and all the German commentators of note. He went into this arrangement as an enthusiast for Biblical studies, and in full sympathy with the movement for such a revision of the authorized English Version of the Scriptures as would correct admitted errors, and embody the approved results of modern textual criticism and bib-

lical research for the benefit of all the Protestant churches of the English tongue. His part in the work, however, like that of several other scholars, was merely of a preliminary and strictly literary character; the final revision, for popular use, being reserved for a special commission, which has since completed the revision of the New Testament.

In this connection Dr. Lillie labored for five years with great zeal and energy. He fixed up a study with exquisite scholarly taste in the venerable Baptist church in Broome street, and felt perfectly happy in the company of all the great Bible translators and commentators, whose stately folios and handy octavos were laid out before him, together with grammars, dictionaries, and other auxiliary works of ancient and modern lore.

He prepared in the service of the Bible Union new versions and philological commentaries on the Epistles to the Thessalonians, the Epistles of John, the Second Epistle of Peter, the Epistle of Jude, and the Revelation;* which were published in 1854 and 1856 in beautiful quarto style in three columns, containing the Greek text, King James' Version, and the Revised Version, the greater part of the page being occupied with learned notes, and the amplest references to former versions and commentaries. They were published, however, merely as literary works, with the express declaration of the Bible Union "that the translation is not final." These philological commentaries, together with the similar works of Dr. Conant on Job and on Matthew, and of Dr. Hackett on the Epistle to Philemon, are undoubtedly the most scholarly publications of the "American Bible Union," and have a permanent exegetical and critical value. The late Dr. Joseph Addison Alexander, of Princeton, often spoke in very high terms of Dr. Lillie's commentaries, and expressed to him the wish that he might treat in the same thorough manner all the books of the New Testament. Dean Alford, of England, was stimulated by them to write his article on "Bible Revision" in the *Edinburgh Review*.

Close application to study somewhat weakened the otherwise vigorous health of Dr. Lillie. In June, 1854, he sailed for Europe and returned in October, fully restored for his work.

In 1857, he accepted a call to the First Presbyterian church at Kingston, N. Y., where he labored faithfully and acceptably till his death. In January, 1867, he paid a visit to New York, and was hale and strong and in excellent spirits. On his return, Saturday, January 19, during a snow storm of unusual severity, he caught a cold, but recovered, and attended to his pastoral duties till the week of his death. On Sunday, the 17th of February, he preached his last sermon with unusual vigor and solemnity; on the day following he was taken sick with inflammation of the lungs, and on Saturday, the 23d, in the fifty-fifth year of his life on earth, he peacefully fell asleep to awake in his heavenly home. He bore the severe pains of his illness without a murmur,—so completely had his naturally irritable temper been softened and subdued by Divine grace. He left behind him a most amiable and worthy wife (a daughter of A. Bruyn Hasbrouck, LL.D., late President of Rutgers College, N. J.), and six promising sons and daughters. His funeral was largely attended, the church being insufficient to accommodate the assemblage of ministers and people. On March 17, 1867, the Rev. W. Irvin, of Rondout, N. Y., at the request of the First Presbyterian church of Kingston, preached an appropriate memorial sermon in the Reformed Dutch church of that place, to which he had devoted the first years of his ministry. The session of his church, as also that of the Reformed Dutch church of Kingston, the Ulster County Bible Society, and the higher ecclesiastical courts with which he was connected, gave fit expression to their high sense of esteem and affection, in a number of highly complimentary resolutions.

Besides the exegetical works already mentioned, Dr. Lillie wrote a volume of Expository Practical Lectures on the Epistles to the Thessalonians (published by his friends and countrymen, Messrs. R. Carter & Brothers, N. Y., 1860), and occasional sermons and pamphlets, which are all written with great care and some of which were published by request. He finished in manuscript a Commentary on the First Epistle of Peter, which he regarded as his best work, and which we hope will before long be given to the public.

* Also the First Epistle of Peter and the Epistle of James; but these were never printed.

The last work of his life was the translation of the Commentary on the Thessalonians for the American edition of Lange's *Bible-Work.* I could not have found in America a scholar better qualified for this task than Dr. Lillie, who had made the Epistle to the Thessalonians the subject of repeated and thorough study, and had already published on this portion of the Scriptures a philologico-critical commentary with a new translation, and a volume of Practical Expository Lectures. He finished the manuscript of the translation a few weeks before his death, but read the proof only of the first sixteen pages. The task of completing his work fell upon me, as the responsible editor. I read the proof with scrupulous regard to his copy. Lillie's Thessalonians will be found to be one of the best executed portions of the American edition of Lange. The translation is remarkably accurate and elegant, and the additions from his own researches and the best English commentaries are carefully selected and valuable. He took great delight in this task, especially in the critical notes below the text, and would have contributed other portions to this Biblical work, had Providence spared his life. I had already assigned to him the Apocalypse (for which, by his previous labors and his deep interest in eschatology, he was likewise thoroughly prepared), and the books of Leviticus and Numbers.

Dr. Lillie was undoubtedly one of the first classical and Biblical scholars in the United States. He would have adorned a chair of Biblical Literature in any of our Theological Seminaries, although his difficulty of hearing might have interfered somewhat with his efficiency as a teacher. He was naturally a close student, and had rare opportunities for cultivating his talents in the best institutions of his native Scotland. He was remarkably accurate and nice, even to the smallest minutiæ of Greek accents and punctuation. Besides the Latin, Greek and Hebrew, he had mastered the French, German and other modern languages. He was at home in the ancient and the English classics, and in the vast field of Biblical literature, especially in the critical department.

He was, moreover, an earnest, solemn, and impressive preacher, a faithful pastor, a conscientious and devout Christian, a genial, hospitable companion, with a stout Scotch heart, an ardent temper, strong affections, and a frank, social disposition. In his theology he was thoroughly orthodox and evangelical, but with a strong leaning to millennarianism, and considerable sympathy with the spiritual and devotional (but not with the hierarchical and ritualistic) features of the Irvingite movement. He admired the writings of Auberlen, the author of a portion of the commentary on the Thessalonians. Much as he cherished the hope of the second coming of Christ, he knew how to subordinate disputed eschatological opinions to the great central truths of the gospel, on which the churches are agreed.

In personal appearance, Dr. Lillie was a fine-looking, robust gentleman, with a genial face and manly bearing, very neat in his dress and methodical in all his habits. He was called away in the midst of his usefulness to see his Lord and Master face to face, for whose coming he had so often and so earnestly prayed.

To this notice I am happy to add a tribute to the memory of Dr. Lillie from the pen of his countryman, fellow-student, and life-long friend, the Rev. James Inglis, who edits in this city a highly spiritual and devotional periodical, *The Witness.* The letter, which I subjoin, with his kind permission, breathes the spirit of a sweet and holy friendship that was made in heaven and for heaven, and outlives the fleeting changes of earth. It reminds me of those beautiful lines in which Gregory Nazianzen, in a sad moment of temporary alienation, describes his friendship with Basil, which commenced in the community of literary study at Athens, and culminated in the consecration of their souls to Christ and the service of His Church:

Τοιαῦτ' Ἀθῆναι, καὶ πόνοι κοινοὶ λόγων,
Ὁμόστεγός τε καὶ συνέστιος βίος,
Νοῦς εἷς ἐν ἀμφοῖν, οὐ δύω, θαῦμ' Ἑλλάδος,
Καὶ δεξιαὶ, κόσμον μὲν ὡς πόῤῥω βαλεῖν,
Αὐτοὺς δὲ κοινὸν τῷ Θεῷ ξῆσαι βίον,
Λόγους τε δοῦναι τῷ μόνῳ σοφῷ Λόγῳ.

NEW YORK, *October* 12, 1867.

REV. DR. SCHAFF:

DEAR SIR:

Any of the early and intimate friends of Dr. Lillie would be embarrassed in speaking publicly of his memory; I most of all, who, in the intimate associations of our college life, when I shared the same room with him, knew him best. Our embarrassment arises from his superiority as known to us, to all that he ever made himself publicly known to be; so that our severest estimate of him might be regarded as the partial judgment of affection. Professor Pillans in his old age stated to me that John Lillie was the most accomplished scholar of all the pupils who had passed from his care in a professional career, which, at Eton and Edinburgh, extended over more than half a century. Probably any member of the Faculty of Letters in the University of Edinburgh at that day, would have endorsed this testimony. His attainments at the age of twenty-one, were not those of a precociously brilliant or a merely studious youth, but rather those of a vigorous and cultivated mind in its maturity. When from this distance of time I recall them, they seem more wonderful to me now than they did then. If he did not fulfil all the high expectations which we cherished of his future eminence in the world, his was not the failure of a superficial precocity which had awakened hopes which it could not make good, but the sacrifice of worldly ambition to the higher aims of an office to which he was called by the Lord, by whose blood he was redeemed, and by whose love he was constrained. We are more than content with his loss of an earthly crown, since we know that "when the Chief Shepherd shall appear," the loss will be compensated by a crown of glory which fadeth not away.

The life of such a student as he was, was necessarily far apart from the vices and follies which dishonored the name of student in that day. But besides the habits which kept him aloof from ignoble dissipations, he was distinguished by a peculiar sensitiveness of honor, truthfulness and purity which gained involuntary respect even from those who were irritated by its living reproof. The tone of his mind was indicated by an enthusiastic admiration of the prose works of Milton, upon which his early style and use of English were moulded. The inspiration of liberty from that source determined him to seek a home in America. After years of separation I saw what the grace of God could effect even in such a character as his; I saw the difference between the fruit of the Spirit and the highest human virtue.

He was what is styled a Calvinist, not as a mere theologian, but as a Christian whose soul yielded a reverent and uncavilling submission to what God has been pleased to reveal of Himself, and what to many are mere speculations or party distinctions, were to him divine and influential verities. He was clear and uncompromising in his testimony to the truth as it is in Jesus, in whose glorious person and perfect work he found life and all that satisfies life. To him it was evidently a small matter to be judged of man's judgment, and so he was often found on the unpopular side with the truth of God. He was the earnest advocate of Millennarianism, when to be a Millennarian was to expose himself to ecclesiastical ostracism. He dared take the attitude of a candid enquirer into the claims of the self-styled "Catholic Apostolic Church." But when it is said that "he sympathized with some features of the Irvingite movement," it should be known that it was not with the doctrinal system nor with the ritualism of that Church that he sympathized.

His sympathy, so far as it went, arose from his exalted conception of what the Holy Scriptures teach of the Church as the temple of the Holy Ghost, the body of Christ, invested, as the representative of her Head, with His authority and endowed with His ascension gifts; and from his convictions regarding the destiny of the Church as the bride, the Lamb's wife—in the words of one of his published sermons, "The Queen-consort of a renewed and emancipated world," in which the everlasting purpose of Divine love will be accomplished and the manifold wisdom of God will be displayed. He could not be satisfied with low views of the Church as a voluntary association of men, defining its own prerogatives, framing its own laws, choosing its own ministry, whose qualifications and functions it prescribes, adapting itself to the expediencies of the hour, and renouncing a heavenly destiny for the empty boast of a temporal triumph. He was attracted by the pretensions of a body which claimed to realize his august conception, or, permit me to say, the divine revelation of the Church's existence, and which, in its testimony, gave great prominence to the Church's glorious destiny. But the fact that he did not die in the communion of "the Catholic Apostolic Church," is the proof that, on careful examination, he did not find its pretensions substantiated.

Pardon me that I have written at such length on these points to you who are so much more capable than I am to do justice to the character, gifts and views of my friend. I know what your friendship was to him in his lifetime, and I am happy that it is your hand that is to pen the brief record which will associate his memory with the enduring work in which he counted it a privilege to be your fellow-laborer. For me t would perhaps have seemed more fitting that I should speak only of the generosity and tenderness of his

unfailing friendship, and the disinterestedness of his brotherly love. The memory of these is rather to be cherished as a solace of the "little while" which separates me from him who was the last of the friends of life's spring-tide who remained to be the companion of its autumn days, and the only one of them whose sympathy relieved "the sear and yellow leaf" with the light of that blessed hope in which he sleeps, and in which

I am, Dear Sir,

Yours, with high respect,

JAMES INGLIS.

PREFACE.

The exposition of the two Epistles to the Thessalonians was at first undertaken by my dear colleague, Professor Dr. Auberlen, who, however, was able to complete only the first two chapters of the First Epistle. A disease, which unhappily compelled him for years to forego severe labor, led him, on an understanding with the esteemed editor, to commit to my hands the continuation of the work. It grieves me that he was not to live to see the task accomplished. On May 2d of the present year he entered into rest.

For the Introduction to the First Epistle and for the last three chapters of the same, as well as for the whole of the Second, I alone am to be held responsible. The two chapters executed by my predecessor I went over along with him; but here, with the exception of a few additions* to which he assented, every thing is from his hand. May the reader not find in what follows too great a contrast. Some points in which I slightly differ from the view of my late friend are in part too unimportant to require alteration, as, for example, the way in which ἔμπροσθεν is connected with what precedes (i. 8); the view of the dative ὑμῖν (ii. 10); the question to what ὅς refers (ii. 13); in other cases subsequent opportunities were found of recurring to them; thus, in regard to ἔργον τῆς πίστεως (i. 3) I refer to the note on 2 Thess. i. 11, and a small supplement in reference to the handicraft of the Apostle is furnished at 2 Thess. iii. 7–9.

For what help I am indebted to Dr. Stockmeyer, Pastor of St. Martin's, Basel, is mentioned in the Homiletical and Practical Notes to 1 Thess. iv. 1–8.

In now sending forth, along with the legacy of an honored divine, the first fruits of my labor in this department, I can but wish and pray God, that the joint work may promote the understanding of these glorious Epistles, love to the truth therein proclaimed, and the edification of the Church of Christ.

Dr. C. J. Riggenbach.

Basel, June, 1864.

* [Distinguished in the original by brackets, and here by also appending the name of the writer.—J. L.]

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

THESSALONIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. TO WHOM THE EPISTLE WAS ADDRESSED.

THESSALONICA (see Winer, *Realwörterbuch*), called Therme by Herodotus and Thucydides, lies at the head of the *Sinus Thermaicus*. The later name was given to it by Cassander in honor of his wife Thessalonica, a daughter of Philip. (Others allege that the name was intended to commemorate a victory over the Thessalians.) Under the Romans Thessalonica was the chief city of the second region of the province of Macedonia, and the residence of a Roman Prætor and Quæstor. Pliny mentions it as *libera*. Subsequently it is called *Metropolis*, and that not only for Macedonia, but also for Achaia. Throughout the whole mediæval period it is a city of importance, belonging for a time to Venice, but since 1430 to Turkey.* At present it bears the slightly abbreviated name of Saloniki, and still, as in the time of the Romans, the population is large, and includes thousands of Jews. What was wanting in Philippi Paul found in this flourishing capital and emporium—namely, a synagogue.

The founding of the church in this place is related in Acts xvii. 1 sqq. It was one of the fruits of the second missionary journey, Acts xv.–xviii., and the second church † that arose on the European continent. First in Philippi (where perished republican Rome a century before) had the Apostle had fulfilled to him the promise implied in that vision of the man of Macedonia (Acts xvi. 9). And there too he had had his first experience of a persecution springing altogether from heathen motives. The selfishness of those who made their gains by soothsaying had turned against him the pretext of the *religio illicita*. After the bloody violence, and while his wounds could scarcely yet have been healed, he had in company with Silas, his fellow-sufferer, and with Timothy‡, on whom the persecution had not fallen, repaired in joyous elevation of spirit to Thessalonica.

* [CONYBEARE and HOWSON, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, c. ix.: "The heroic age of Thessalonica was the third century. It was the bulwark of Constantinople in the shock of the barbarians; and it held up the torch of the truth to the successive tribes who overspread the country between the Danube and the Ægean,—the Goths and the Sclavons, the Bulgarians of the Greek Church, and the Wallachians, whose language still seems to connect them with Philippi and the Roman colonies. Thus, in the mediæval chroniclers, it has deserved the name of 'the Orthodox City.'"—J. L.]

† [Or possibly the third. It is not improbable that the church at Rome, as well as that of Philippi, preceded it.—J. L.]

‡ [That is not equally certain. Only Paul and Silas are mentioned at the departure from Philippi, and during the stay at Thessalonica. Timothy *may* for some reason have been left behind at the former place, as he was afterwards at Berœa. Or the omission of his name may be accounted for as in Doctrinal Note 2 on 1 Thess. iii. 2.—J. L.]

He made his appearance in the synagogue, where he found ready such a point of attachment as it was his principle to avail himself of (agreeably to Rom. i. 16; ix. 4, 5, and not at variance with the geographical partition of Gal. ii. 9). Starting from the Scriptures of the Old Testament, he sketched the full prophetic image of the suffering and risen Messiah, and then he set forth the fulfilment, to wit, that in Jesus the predicted Christ had appeared. The Second Epistle shows us how he especially expounded to them the prophet Daniel. Some (not many) Jews were convinced, together with a great multitude of devout Greeks (proselytes);—the insufficiently attested reading καὶ Ἑλλήνων would distinguish between devout persons (proselytes) *and* Greeks (still altogether heathen); that some had been idolaters is presupposed also at 1 Thess. i. 9;—and, lastly, special prominence is given to the fact that not a few of the most honorable women believed; not that a higher value is put upon their souls on account of their rank, but they had more opposition to overcome than others. It is moreover implied in the exhortations of 1 Thess. iv. 6–11 that the majority of the converts consisted of tradesmen and mechanics. All these by God's appointment fell to the Apostle's share,* after he had preached in the synagogue only three sabbaths, though no doubt he did so in the intervals also, as his custom was, to wit, within doors while working with his hands (1 Thess. ii. 9). But that he still labored on in the young separated church for some time *after* the three sabbaths is improbable (against WIESELER, *Chronol. des apost. Zeitalters*, p. 40; and others†); for the Apostolic History, without giving the least hint (as in Acts xviii. 7; xix. 9) of such a continuance of labor, connects immediately with the mention of the three sabbaths the account of the uproar that drove the Apostle away. Again, that the Apostle worked at his trade proves nothing for a longer stay; and quite as little does the statement (Phil. iv. 16), that the Philippians had sent him presents once and again to Thessalonica. It may even be questioned whether Paul here refers to his first residence in Thessalonica; but even so, the two communications may have followed quickly one on the other.

Thus within scarcely three weeks‡ was formed a numerous and flourishing congregation. The time, indeed, was fully occupied, the people in a susceptible state of mind, and Paul fervent in spirit, as also the Epistles show; but the phenomenon is still an extraordinary one, and Paul himself holds it up as such.

The powerful movement was met by a powerful hostility. The unbelieving Jews knew how to use idle people in stirring up a tumult. The Apostle himself they did not find, but his host Jason and some other Christians they dragged before the *Præfectus urbis* on a charge slanderous, but crafty, and adapted to Roman ears. These seditious men, they said, who had agitated the whole *orbis Romanus*, incited to revolt against the Emperor by proclaiming Jesus as king. Just at that time the Jews (*assidue tumultuantes*, Sueton.) had been expelled from Rome by Claudius (Acts xviii. 2), and found themselves everywhere jealously watched as disturbers of the peace. How gladly did they now seize on the pretext, for the sake of clearing themselves, and fastening an effective calumny on those they hated! The reproach that is cast at us lights only on them. So they feigned loyalty, and betrayed their dearest religious hopes to the princes of worldly empire; precisely like the accusers of Jesus before Pilate (Luke xxiii. 2; John xix. 12 sqq.). The Apostle is struck by the resemblance, 1 Thess. ii. 14 sqq. It is commonly supposed that the peculiar emphasis laid by Paul in his preaching on the βασιλεία θεοῦ (1 Thess. i. 10, and elsewhere)§ had given occasion to this perversion. But it is no less true that the wickedness of the Jews, of which he had already had manifold experience, impelled the Apostle, as being itself a momentous sign of the time, to proclaim the nearness of the judg-

* [" *Fielen dem Apostel von Gott als sein Loos zu;*"—so the author would give the peculiar force of προσεκληρώθησαν, Acts xvii. 4.—J. L.]

† [Including BENSON, PALEY, DAVIDSON, CONYBEARE and HOWSON, &c.—J. L.]

‡ [ALFORD: "We are hardly justified in assuming, with Jowett, that it was only three weeks. For 'three Sabbaths', even if they mark the whole stay, may designate four weeks: and we are not compelled to infer that a Sabbath may not have passed at the beginning, or the end, or both, on which he did not preach in the synagogue."—J. L.]

§ [This idea is favored also by the special charge urged at Thessalonica against the preachers, to wit, that they were revolutionary propagandists, "doing contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, saying, that there is another king, Jesus," Acts xvii. 7.—J. L.]

ment. That Israel is filling up the measure of his obduracy, is an idea with which he is fully impressed. Therefore does he proclaim the coming of the Lord, but, of course, in a manner remote from all political offence. The Roman magistracy is spiritually incapable of investigating the matter; the people are alarmed by fears about the uproar and Roman vengeance; but the course of the authorities is moderate. They take security that no disturbances are meditated; and Paul, to spare the young church a renewal of the storm, withdraws to Berœa. From this place, which lay not two days' journey to the south-west, he might still work in the direction of Thessalonica. But the Jews of this city showed themselves to be peculiarly implacable adversaries (as Saul had been before the day of Damascus). They drove him also from Berœa, and he, leaving behind his two attendants, set off for Athens.

The Apostolic History makes no mention at all of Timothy as having come to Paul at Athens, and as having been sent from there to Thessalonica (1 Thess. iii. 1, 2), but only that he came again to him from Macedonia, Acts xviii. 5; comp. 1 Thess. iii. 6. Where Paul was at that time, the Epistle does not tell us. According to the Acts, the meeting took place at Corinth, and indeed along with Timothy Silas also came from Macedonia. And so it appears likewise from 1 Thess. i. 1, that both of his assistants were with the Apostle when he wrote the letter. As to whether and how the accounts from these two sources may be more closely adjusted, see the note on 1 Thess. iii. On the whole it is evident that, while independent of one another, they agree well together.

§ 2. PLACE, TIME, AND OCCASION OF WRITING.

From what was last mentioned we may gather that the subscription in old manuscripts: "Written from Athens," is not only (as are all these subscriptions) spurious, but also incorrect. It arose probably as a hasty inference from 1 Thess. iii. 1, as if the place where Paul wrote must have been the same as that from which he sent Timothy. In Corinth rather was our Epistle written, and indeed at the time when Paul was commencing his labors in that city; not very long after the conversion of the Thessalonians (1 Thess. i. 9); immediately after Timothy's return to Paul (1 Thess. iii. 6, ἄρτι); consequently in the year 53 * (prior to 54 when Claudius died, comp. Acts xviii. 2; and see WIESELER, *Chronol. des ap. Zeitalters*, p. 253). Such is also the old and generally received opinion. That in favor of its later composition (WURM: at the date of Acts xviii. 22; SCHRADER: at that of xx. 2; KÖHLER, on account of 1 Thess. ii. 14 sqq.: not till the time of the Jewish war, later than Acts xxviii.) rests on untenable grounds. The mention of presidents (1 Thess. v. 12)—and that without any official title—does not disprove the recent establishment of the church. Though at a later period, when a selection could be made, no novices were chosen (1 Tim. iii. 6), yet Acts xiv. 23 shows that Paul left no church without presidents. Further on we shall meet with still other considerations that are supposed to support a later composition, and shall find them equally invalid.

But what it was that prompted the Apostle to write is easily explained from the condition of the church. The faithful pastor could not but be deeply concerned about it. He knew that quick conversion is not experience and confirmation. Except where circumstances prevented, he always spent considerable time on the firm settlement of a church (Acts xviii. 11, 18; xix. 8, 10). But driven as he had been so soon from Thessalonica by violence, he sought from a distance to provide against the noble church being again torn from him by persecution or seduction (1 Thess. iii. 5). Twice he sought to return in person (1 Thess. ii. 18); once perhaps from Berœa. And when this, probably on account of the threatening malice of his enemies, could not be accomplished (*Satan hindered us*, he says), he sent Timothy in his stead (1 Thess. iii. 2). Nor was this any light task for his still youthful associate, who seems, indeed, thus far to have less attracted the enemies' notice. Through the reports of Timothy the Apostle was greatly rejoiced (1 Thess. iii. 6 sqq.); he was able to thank God that under all persecutions (ch. i. 6; ii. 14 sqq.; iii. 3) they were steadfast in the faith, an example to all (ch. i. 7) in brotherly love (ch. iv. 9), and in the Christian walk generally (ch. iv. 1 sqq.). Still his longing to be able

* [SCHAFF dates both Epistles in 53; CONYBEARE, ALFORD, and ELLICOTT, in 52–53; LÜNEMANN, in 53–54; LANGE, about 54–55.—J. L.]

to visit them himself is not at all abated (ch. iii. 10 sqq.); rather it was just what he had learned through Timothy that induces him in the mean time to commune with them at least by letter. He will thereby yet further strengthen what Timothy has wrought, draw ever tighter the bond between him sel and te church, and by his exhortation supply what he had observed to be wanting in them. As the readers of the Epistle are there represented, they appear to us throughout standing in the freshness of their faith and first love, but yet as beginners, in need of establishment; troubled, on the one hand, by a want of clear apprehension, and in danger, on the other, from the terrors of persecution and the power of delusion. The Apostle, however, treats them with a noble tenderness, without expressing distrust on account of their inexperience, and knows how to combine in the wisest way encouragement with admonition.

§ 3. GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE.

What OLSHAUSEN wrote as early as 1840 about the First Epistle to the Thessalonians being one of the few New Testament Epistles, that have had the good fortune to be attacked neither formerly nor in recent times, was not quite correct even then. For already in 1835 had BAUR (*die Pastoralbriefe*) and in 1836 SCHRADER (*der Apostel Paulus*) brought forward at least suspicions against its genuineness. Since then BAUR (*Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi*, 1845, p. 480; with corroborations in *theol. Jahrbb.*, 1855, II.) has decided against the authenticity not only of the Second, but also of the First Epistle; not, however, that this was any misfortune for it; for the result can only be the recognition so much the more thorough of its peculiar character and high value.

The evidence of antiquity for our Epistle is neither stronger nor weaker than it is, *e. g.*, for the Epistle to the Galatians, and the so-called internal grounds are all that Baur urges against it. He finds the contents unimportant; there is an utter lack of special interest, of precise motive; mere general exhortations, instructions, wishes, which in other Epistles occur incidentally, are here the main thing. Besides, the Epistle shows itself to be dependent on the book of Acts and on other Epistles; especially do we meet with many things to remind us of the Epistles to the Corinthians. The very detailed statement of the conversion of the Thessalonians appears to be altogether aimless; why write to a church everything that it knows from its own experience? Moreover, it is assumed that the church has not been long in existence, and yet it is asserted that in every place it is commended as an example of faith (ch. i. 7, 8); that it has already shown its brotherly love to the brethren in all Macedonia (ch. iv. 10); that withal there is already imminent danger of the prevalence of an idling disposition (ch. iv. 11); and already has Paul once and again desired to return to Thessalonica (ch. ii. 17 sq.). That the Epistle speaks of the coming of the Lord in a very familiar way, Baur is compelled to allow; essentially as 1 Cor. xv.; and then again, he thinks, quite otherwise, far more in the style of the Jewish Rabbis than in that place. So also the way in which it speaks of the sufferings of the Jewish Christians, and already takes for granted the destruction of Jerusalem (ch. ii. 14, 16), is quite unpauline; and equally so 1 Thess. v. 27.

BAUR's attack has met with nothing but contradiction: from KOCH (1848), then especially from LÜNEMANN (1850–59),from WILIB. GRIMM (*Stud. und Krit.*, 1850, iv.), LANGE (*das ap. Zeitalter*, I. 108; 1853), REUSS (*Gesch. der heil. Schriften des Neuen Testam.*, 2d ed., 1853; 3d ed., 1860. "The suspicion appears to be arbitrary, got up to favor a historical system."), GUERIKE (*Isagogik*, 2d ed., 1854), LIPSIUS (who indeed sets up untenable fictions of his own, *Stud. und Krit.*, 1854, IV.; against him Lünemann and others), HOFMANN (*die heil. Schrift Neuen Testaments*, I. 270; 1862), BLEEK (*Einleitung in's Neue Testament*, 1862), and even (as regards the First Epistle) from HILGENFELD (*Zeitschrift für Wissensch. Theologie*), 1862, III.

That the contents of the Epistle are unimportant can be affirmed by BAUR only from his having an eye exclusively for abstract ideas, and not for living personal interests. He partly contradicts himself, when in the section on the *Parousia* he finds the (solitary) dogmatic idea that had led to the composition of the Epistle. At the same time, on the affinity and the difference of this idea, compared with the teaching of the Apostle elsewhere, he decides just as he

does on the questions of style. When a resemblance presents itself, it must be a servile imitation; but let a peculiar thought or an original application occur, then it is said: That is unpauline. In truth, the points of agreement with other Epistles are not more marked than, for example, between the Epistle to the Romans and that to the Galatians, and in every instance the word suits the connection. On the other hand, what there is of peculiar is by no means unapostolic. The exposition will have to show how very Pauline the whole is, even to the niceties of thought and style.

On the whole, it must be said that BAUR even precludes himself from understanding the Epistle. What he urges with most plausibility is, the features that seem to be inconsistent with the composition of the Epistle soon after the establishment of the church. But if we reckon the Apostle's ministry in Berœa, in Athens, and now also in Corinth at about half a year, and represent to ourselves, moreover, the unusually striking character of the conversion that had here taken place, we perceive that a speedy and widespread propagation of the important news is fully explained; and nowhere more easily than at a maritime emporium, like Corinth, might people come from all sides to whom Paul had no need to tell the story of Thessalonica, as the report thereof had already reached them. As to Paul's having by this time desired once and again to visit Thessalonica, on that point after what was said before not another word need be wasted. That the church should already have shown its brotherly love towards the Christians in Macedonia, and that, on the contrary, there were faults to be censured, such as a fanatical indolence, how long time after its establishment was required for that? Indeed, of the latter fact it is to be said, that it is more easily accounted for at the beginning, immediately after the conversion, than subsequently at a time of quiet composure.

Still more is that the case in regard to the doctrine of the resurrection. To be sure, BAUR thinks that the anxiety about the Christians who had fallen asleep cannot be conceived as existing only a few months after the founding of the church, but rather implies that nearly a generation of Christians had already died. But could there not be anxiety as to the fate of the departed, though there were but a few of them? some perhaps martyrs? or even though none had died? if only, in the time of persecution, the nearness of death stood more than usually threatening before the eyes of all? Nay, must we not ask in turn: Supposing that the Epistle were spurious, not written till a lifetime after the founding of the church, at a period also when the clear apostolic instruction had long been everywhere spread abroad, what forger would still have invented even then such a case of dark apprehension, as that the dead might fare worse than those who should survive till the Coming? But this apprehension might easily arise among novices, who had enjoyed the apostolic instruction for only three weeks. Not less are we justified in asking: What forger would have allowed the Apostle, a lifetime after Paul's death, to write about the hope that he himself might survive till the Coming (ch. iv. 17)? As composed in the beginning and by Paul himself, the whole is intelligible; as a fiction of a late date, the whole becomes incomprehensible.

That holds good also in a particular relation. BAUR finds something at variance with the Apostle's manner, in the way in which the author sets up the Jewish Christians as a model, and assails the Jews without. He is able to recognize him only when he is contending with the Jewish Christians. But the real Apostle informs us how the churches in Judea rejoiced in his ministry (Gal. i. 22 sqq.), and at a much later date he makes collections for the saints in Jerusalem. On the other hand, he suffered not only from the false brethren, but expressly also from the Jews (2 Cor. xi. 24–26). And that is what we meet with in Thessalonica; not yet, as afterwards in many places, a Judaistic strife within the church, but, suitably to the earlier period, an attack from without by altogether unbelieving Jews. There is no ground for the idea of LIPSIUS, that the Apostle is trying beforehand (ch. ii. 3, 5, 6) to avert Judaistic aspersions; it was rather unbelieving Jews that slandered the Apostles as agitators, and as persons who flattered the people from motives of ambition and greed. The Romans would not of themselves have thought thus early of regarding the gospel as dangerous to the state; their moderate course even shows, that they laid no great stress on the slander itself. Those who got it up were Jews. That Jews perceived sooner than the heathen the power of the gospel to transform the

world, is what was to be expected; that they raised the charge of a revolutionary movement, is the lie of their passionate hatred. Therefore also does the Apostle pronounce on them a severe, but well-merited, judgment (ch. ii. 14 sqq.). They have killed their Messiah, as formerly their old prophets; the followers of the Messiah in Judea they have persecuted, and now also they have driven out us Apostles; from Thessalonica last of all, but on previous occasions also (comp. Acts ix. 23, 29; xiii. 50; xiv. 19). The aorist cannot hinder us from referring the statement to the whole of the persecution of the Apostle, which is thus taken together as one act; and so likewise in the case of the prophets. But in this way, says the Apostle, they fill up the measure of their ungodly and misanthropic temper. It is not simply the *odium generis humani*, in the sense of a Tacitus, that he upbraids them with, but that they are contrary to men, in that they will not suffer the word of salvation to be spoken to the Gentiles. So now the wrath is come upon them, ready for the final burst. Does not the Apostle here speak quite like a prophet of God, just as in Rom. ix.?

And to what now does the whole amount? What of the detailed recital of things that the Thessalonians knew by their own experience? In this De Wette also sees nothing but a gushing of the heart, and thinks that only in the exhortations and instructions (chh. iv. and v.) are we to seek for the object of the Epistle. We hold, on the contrary, that to describe the first three chapters as aimless is nothing else but to confess that one does not yet understand the Epistle; whereas thoroughly to understand it will be the best vindication of its genuineness.

§ 4. COURSE OF THOUGHT AND IMPORTANCE OF THE EPISTLE.

The very simple course of thought in the Epistle is as follows: After the salutation ch. i. 1 comes the

FIRST PART, CH. I. 2—III. 13, PERSONAL AND HISTORICAL.

I. Ch. i. 2—ii. 16. Paul signifies to the Thessalonians the genuineness of his preaching and of their faith.

1) Ch. i. 2–7. He begins with thanksgiving for the state of the church. He is sure of their Divine election. How? Because of the peculiar joyousness and power of his preaching, that had there been granted to him and his companions, and because of the unreserved readiness with which they received the word. The extraordinary result is for him an ever memorable work of God.

2) Ch. i. 8–10. Others also far and wide have been struck both with the agency of the Apostle and the conversion of the Thessalonians.

So should the Thessalonians likewise be ever mindful not to allow themselves to be withdrawn from the ground of their former experience. To recall afresh and explain what they had gone through ought to retain them in this position.

Once more, and with yet greater exactness, he reviews both sides of their experience:

3) a. Ch. ii. 1–12. The conduct of the Apostles, when, coming from their recent ill treatment at Philippi, they had so joyfully proclaimed the gospel, free from all deceit, impurity, and selfishness. By this too he would establish them—arm them, that is, against all insinuations that might possibly have staggered them. Let Jewish calumny charge us with what it will, and let Gentile adversaries repeat it, in order to turn you away from us; you know that your experience of us has been different. And so he

b. Ch. ii. 13–16, bears testimony to their hearty faith, through which they had willingly endured all opposition; they have thereby (they first from among the Gentiles) entered into the noble fellowship of the oldest churches persecuted for the gospel's sake; but the instigators of the hostility will be overtaken by the judgment.

It tends mightily to strengthen them, when he interprets to them their experience, and opens to them a clear insight into the state of the times. But that they may understand how that even after his expulsion he had by no means unfeelingly abandoned them, he informs them

II. Ch, ii. 17—iii. 13, what he had done for them since his departure;

1) Ch. ii. 17–20, how he had once and again desired to come to them;

2) Ch. iii. 1–5, how he had sent Timothy in his stead, and so for their sakes had deprived himself of his attendance;

3) Ch. iii. 6–13, how he is now full of thankful joy over his report; yet he intimates at the same time, that he might nevertheless still supply something lacking in them. Since he cannot at present accomplish this in person, he therefore does it at once by letter, and so follows the

SECOND PART, CHH. IV. AND V., DIDACTIC AND HORTATORY.

The warnings that meet us here have reference, first of all, to sins to which the temptation must have been peculiarly great in a Gentile city of maritime trade. Farther on, the instructions and exhortations respect merely such manifestations as could not but occur in a young and unsettled church—cases of indistinctness and excitement in doctrine and life; to this belongs as well the fanatical indolence as the setting aside of ordinary occupations. In particular, we find

1) Ch. iv. 1–8, a warning against fornication and covetousness;

2) Ch. iv. 9–12, an incitement to growth in brotherly love, and, that love be not prejudiced, to quiet and sober industry;

3) Ch. iv. 13—v. 11, instruction and exhortation respecting the coming of the Lord;

a. Ch. iv. 13–18, they who have fallen asleep will rise again, and so at the Lord's advent will suffer no loss;

b. Ch. v. 1–11, but when He will come, we know not; let your walk, therefore, be at all times watchful and sober. Then come

4) Ch. v. 12–24, the closing exhortations: to honor their presidents, to live in peace, to keep themselves free from all bitterness against persecutors, to unite vivacity with sobriety of spirit. The whole concludes

5) Ch. v. 25–28, with the salutation and benediction.

Thus the Epistle is throughout adapted to the need of the church—an exceedingly significant example of fatherly loving care of a church still in its infancy. And this is just the earliest of the Apostle's letters that have been preserved to us.

It was natural that in the Epistle to the Galatians, whose life of faith was threatened by false doctrine, Paul should have had to let his dialectics act in a quite different fashion. It was natural that the spiritual life of the Corinthians, much more richly developed, but distracted also by internal division, should have demanded from the Apostle work of more varied thought. In the Epistle to the Colossians also he has to do with an adulteration of the Gospel, and one indeed more refined. If the Epistle to the Romans marks the highest achievement of the apostolic thought, and that to the Ephesians the mightiest prophetic flight of his spirit, the one that comes nearest to our Epistle in tone and style is that to the Philippians. And this is readily understood; for the two Macedonian churches, less conspicuous for a high display of the charisms, than for the inner life of faith and love, gave the heart of the Apostle for that very reason the most untroubled joy. But such is the rich fulness of his apostolic spirit, that he was able to be to all his churches all that they required.

Of the style of our Epistle BENGEL says: *Habet hæc epistola meram quandam dulcedinem, quæ lectori dulcibus affectibus non assueto minus sapit quam ceteræ, severitate quadam palatum stringentes.*

§ 5. LITERATURE.

Of the older literature a detailed estimate is given by PELT. We name CHRYSOSTOM and THEOPHYLACT; ZWINGLI, CALVIN and BEZA; GROTIUS; BENGEL; OLSHAUSEN, DE WETTE, EWALD (*die Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, 1857); PELT (*Gryphiswaldiæ*, 1830); SCHOTT (Lipsiæ, 1834); KOCH (1848; with a new title, 1855); LÜNEMANN (as part of MEYER'S *Handbuch*, 1850; 2d ed., 1859); HOFMANN (*die heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments*, I., 1862).

Practical Expositors: HEINR. STÄHELIN, *das Neue Testament;* M. F. ROOS, *Kurtze Auslegung* (1786); C. H. RIEGER, *Betrachtungen über das Neue Testament;* VON GERLACH; HEUBNER; DIEDRICH, *die Briefe St. Pauli an die Epheser, Philipper, Kolosser und Thessalonicher* (1858).

[Besides these works, and the commentaries on the whole Bible, or on the New Testament, referred to in POLI *Synopsis*, or in the *General Introduction to the Holy Scriptures* in LANGE'S *Matthew*, ed. SCHAFF, p. 19, the student of the Epistles to the Thessalonians may consult the following:—FABER STAPULENSIS, *Epistolæ Pauli cum commentariis*, Paris, 1517; MUSCULUS, *In Pauli Epistolas ad Philipp. etc. commentarii*, Leipzig, 1565; WELLS, *Help for the more clear and easy understanding of the Holy Scriptures*, London, 1709–28 (in this work are anticipated very many of the best results of the modern textual criticism); TURRETINE, *Commentarius in Epp. ad Thess.*, Basel, 1739; GUYSE, *Practical Expositor*, London, 1739–52; BENSON, *Paraphrase and Notes on Six of the Epp. of St. Paul*, 2d ed., London, 1752; WESLEY, *Notes*, &c., Bristol, 1764; PYLE, *Paraphrase on the Acts and the Epp.*, vol. ii., London, 1765; BAUMGARTEN, *Auslegung der Briefe Pauli*, Halle, 1767; MOLDENHAUER, *Gründliche Erläuterung der heiligen Bücher neues Test.*, vol. iii., Leipzig, 1768; J. D. MICHAELIS, *Paraphrasis u. Anmerkungen über die Briefe Pauli an die Gal.*, &c., 2d ed., Bremen and Göttingen, 1769; KRAUSE, *Die Briefe an die Phil. u. Thess.*, Frankfurt, 1790; MACKNIGHT, *on the Epistles*, Edinburgh, 1795; COKE, *Commentary on the N. T.*, London, 1803; KOPPE, *Nov. Test.*, ed. TYCHSEN, Göttingen, 1823; FLATT, *Vorlesungen über die Briefe Pauli*, Tübingen, 1829; TROLLOPE, *Analecta Theologica*, London, 1842; PEILE, *Annotations on the Apostolical Epp.*, vol. iii., London, 1851; CONYBEARE and HOWSON, *Life and Epp. of St. Paul*, London, 1853; JOWETT, *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thess., Gal., Rom.; with Critical Notes and Dissertations;* London, 1855, 1859 (the references are to the former edition); LILLIE, *Revised Version, with Notes, of the Epp. of Paul to the Thess.*, published by the American Bible Union,* New York, 1856, and London, 1858 (containing a very extensive and minute comparative view—on all moot points bearing on the translation—of critical editions, versions, and commentaries.† This work, and my similar one on the closing books of the Canon, II. Pet. Revelation, are here cited under the title of *Revision.*); also my *Lectures* on the same Epp., New York, 1860 (referred to under the title, *Lectures*); ELLICOTT, *Critical and Grammatical Commentary on St. Paul's Epp. to the Thess.*, London, 1858, and Andover, 1864; VAUGHAN, *The Epp. of St. Paul for English Readers*, London, 1864 (No. I., which is all that I have seen, contains the First Ep. to the Thess.).—J. L.]

* [To the officers of the Bible Union I beg leave here to express my sense of obligation for the kind courtesy with which they admitted me to the free use of their excellent library.—J. L.]

† [In the following pages the Editor has paid special attention, in the exegetical department, to the latest representatives of English scholarship—JOWETT, ALFORD (4th ed., 1865), WORDSWORTH (4th ed., 1866), ELLICOTT, WEBSTER, and WILKINSON.—J. L.]

[N. B. For the sake of readier distinction, the small-print notes immediately following the translation will be referred to as *Critical;* the first division of the Commentary, simply as *Exegetical.*—J. L.]

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

THESSALONIANS.

CHAPTER I 1.

SALUTATION.

1 Paul, and Silvanus, and Timotheus [Timothy],[1] unto the church[2] of the Thessalonians *which is*[3] in God the Father and *in*[4] the Lord Jesus Christ: Grace *be* unto you [Grace unto you, χάρις ὑμῖν],[5] and peace (from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ).[6]

[1] [The English form, *Timothy*, occurs seven times in our Authorized Version.—J. L.]

[2] [ἐκκλησία, German: *Gemeinde*, *congregation*. But see Dr. Schaff's note 4 on Matt. xvi. 18.—J. L.]

[3] [The English supplement, *which is*, might better have been omitted.—J. L.]

[4] [The repetition of the *in* is also superfluous.—J. L.]

[5] [See the Auth. Vers. at 2 Thess. i. 2; Rom. i. 7; Philem. 3. Koch: "By the omission of the verb the expression gains in strength and emphasis."—German, after Luther: *sei mit euch*.—J. L.]

[6] The words ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ are wanting in important manuscripts [B. F. G.], versions [Vulgate, Syriac, &c.], and all the [ancient] commentaries, and are therefore bracketed by Bengel and Lachmann, and cancelled by Tischendorf,* Pott, De Wette, Lünemann, and others [Alford, Ellicott, Amer. Bible Union], though defended by Schott, Olshausen, Koch, Reiche, and others. It is an obvious conjecture, that the words were brought here from the opening of the other Pauline Epistles, and in favor of this view is the brevity by which the inscription of this earliest of the Epistles is on the whole distinguished. In the precisely similar opening of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians the words in question are also found, and are there undoubtedly genuine. We let them stand here likewise [in brackets], in accordance with the principle which we intend to follow also in other cases, that for homiletic treatment a various reading only then comes to be of decisive importance, when the authorities are so weighty that a universal, or at least nearly universal, agreement prevails among the critics in regard to it. [In this case, moreover, the common reading is sustained by the *Codex Sinaiticus*,† A. D. E., and other uncials.—J. L.]

* [I refer throughout to Tischendorf's seventh edition, the eighth, now in process of publication, not having got as far as the Epistles.—J. L.]

† [To this already famous manuscript, for which its discoverer, Tischendorf, is probably justified in claiming the primacy in the department of textual criticism (*in se habere rei criticæ principatum*), there is no reference whatever in Dr. Auberlen's portion of this Commentary. The reader will here find the results of a full and careful collation of it (as well as of the modern critical editions) throughout both Epistles.—J. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. Paul, Silvanus, and Timotheus [Timothy].—On *Paul*, see the Acts of the Apostles, and the Introduction to the Epistle to the Romans.—*Silvanus.* He is called in the Acts Silas; by Paul and Peter, Silvanus. A distinguished leader (ἡγούμενος; comp. Lechler at Acts xv. 22) and prophet of the church of Jerusalem, he was chosen by the Apostolic Council as one of the bearers of its decrees to Antioch, where he then remained for a longer period in friendly intercourse with the Gentile Christians, exhorting them and confirming them in the faith (Acts xv. 22, 27, 32 sq.). Even though Acts xv. 34 be not genuine, yet that choice and this sojourn are sufficient to show, that Silas was one of the Jewish Christians who, like Stephen, had from the beginning a freer, open sense for Gentile Christianity and Paulinism. In recognition of this large-heartedness Paul chose him for his attendant on his second missionary journey (Acts xv. 40), during which the church at Thessalonica was founded (see *Introduction*), and so we find him by his side in work and suffering, before magistrates, in stripes, in prison, in prayer, in miraculous deliverance, in flight, Acts xvi. 19, 25, 29; xvii. 4, 10, 14 sq.; xviii. 5. He accordingly appears in the inscriptions of the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, and 2 Cor. i. 19. Subsequently Silvanus is simply mentioned by Peter as bearer of his First Epistle to Asia Minor, where he was already known, ever since Paul's second missionary journey, as "a faithful brother" (1 Pet. v. 12; comp. Fronmüller *in loc.*). Silvanus, from his original position at Jerusalem in friendly relations to Peter, and then a companion of Paul, is a man of whom it must be thought a peculiarly natural thing, that he again appears by the side of Peter, when the latter addressed himself to the at least to some extent Pauline churches of Asia

Minor. He belongs to those men of second rank in the apostolic period, in whom the oneness of the Pauline spirit with that of the first Apostles, and the credibility, of late so severely assailed, of the book of Acts, are in an artless way historically represented. According to the tradition of the ancient Church, Silvanus should have been the first Bishop of Thessalonica, but Silas—whom it distinguishes from Silvanus—Bishop of Corinth (see Winer, *biblisches Realwörterbuch*, 3d ed., II. p. 459, Art. *Silas*). As this distinction is certainly erroneous, since Silas is merely a contraction, such as frequently occurs in proper names, for Silvanus, as Ἀντίπας for Ἀντίπατρος, in German *Niklas* for *Nikolaus*, &c., and since in the Acts we find Silas, and in Paul's Epistles Silvanus, associated with Paul and Timothy at Thessalonica and Corinth, so the whole tradition admits of easy explanation as an arbitrary inference from the New Testament data, Silas appearing for the last time at Corinth, Acts xviii. 5, and Silvanus in the forefront of the Thessalonian Epistles.—On *Timothy*, who had in like manner attended the Apostle during the founding of the Thessalonian church, see the *Introduction* to 1 Tim. Everywhere Paul speaks of Timothy with paternal tenderness, and bears the highest testimony to his character. Not only does he mention him generally as a brother (2 Cor. i. 1; Col. i. 1; Philem. 1; 1 Thess. iii. 2), not only as a servant of God and his own fellow-laborer in the gospel of Christ (1 Thess. iii. 2; Rom. xvi. 21; 1 Cor. xvi. 10), a servant of Jesus Christ, like himself (Phil. i. 1), but he calls him his faithful and beloved, his genuine child in the Lord (1 Cor. iv. 17; 1 Tim. i. 2, 18 [γνησίῳ τέκνῳ]; 2 Tim. i. 2), and writes to the Philippians (ch. ii. 19 sqq.) of their knowing the proof of him, that, as a child the father,* he has served with him in the gospel; indeed he says expressly (v. 20) that he has—so at least during the first Roman imprisonment, when he wrote this—no one likeminded, who will so sincerely and disinterestedly care for the church. Thus in the glorious circle of apostolic men that surrounded Paul Timothy takes the first place. "No one," says F. Ranke, "has the Apostle embraced with more cordial and fatherly affection than Timothy—one of the loveliest and most refreshing sights of the apostolic age."—It is undoubtedly as being the older man that Silvanus is here and 2 Cor. i. 19 *placed before Timothy*,† whose youth is still spoken of in the Epistles written to him at a much later date (1 Tim. iv. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 22). It is worthy of note and agrees with what has just been said, that in the narrative of travel in the Acts (chh. xvi., xvii.) Timothy, after the mention of his being added to the company, is not again immediately named, whereas Silas is mentioned frequently along with Paul. First on occasion of the separation from Paul is Timothy afterwards named along with and after Silas (ch. xvii. 14 sq.; xviii. 5).—The Apostle names, and his practice is similar in other places also (comp., besides the inscriptions of 2 Thess., 2 Cor., Phil., Col., and Philemon, in which Timothy in like manner appears, 1 Cor. i. 1 *Paul and Sosthenes*, and Gal. i. 1, 2 *Paul and all the brethren that are with me*), *Silvanus and Timothy as joint authors*,‡ as virtually joined with him in getting up the Epistle, though he alone is the writer, and dictates the Epistle perhaps only to one of them. As they have preached the Lord together orally (comp. 2 Cor. i. 19), so should also the written word go forth from all the three. The three men who had become dear to the church must again appear before her mental vision united as in the beginning; she must recognize their fair, lasting concord one with another, and know that she has received the same gospel, not merely from an individual, but from the mouth of two and three witnesses (Matt. xviii. 16, 20), and is borne on more than one heart (comp. ver. 2: *we* give thanks). Therefore also Paul does not need to describe Silvanus and Timothy more closely; they are held still in fresh, living remembrance by the church.—For just the same reason also *he does not designate himself more fully as an Apostle*, &c. As already remarked by Calvin, he needs not to come before the Thessalonians with official authority, but merely to recall his person to their memory, as he lived and wrought among them in the power of the Spirit. In this brief, free self-designation Lünemann finds with reason a mark of the earlier composition and authenticity of our Epistles. At a later period, indeed, Paul does not in the inscriptions of his Epistles call himself an Apostle in cases, where he can count on faithful, unimpaired love and recognition on the part of a church or an individual; yet even there the inscriptions are fuller, as Phil. i. 1; Philem. 1. But after that his apostolic authority was assailed, from the time of the Epistle to the Galatians, his general custom was to append his official to his personal name, and then frequently he makes use of that for longer or shorter additions corresponding to the actual contents of the letter, so that no inscription is in all respects the same as another. Even in Thessalonica, it is true, attempts to create distrust were not wanting; but these affected not his apostolic authority as such, but his entire person. This freedom of the Apostle in his self-designations is characteristic and instructive. As he directs his letters, not to the office-bearers, but to the church, so, unless there be a necessity for it, he does not himself come forth in his official authority. He has no stiff official style, but here too he proportions every thing to the circumstances and exigencies of the particular case. Accordingly, he here distinguishes himself by no addition from Silvanus and Timotheus, but simply takes the precedence of them, and thereby at the same time designates himself as properly the author of the Epistle. Certainly in this is shown also the humility of the Apostle, and so far the remark is not incorrect, that Paul omitted his apostolic title out of modesty, whether towards the Thessalonians (Chrysostom, &c.), or towards Silvanus and Timothy Zwingli, Pott, &c.). Only we are not to find here the proper motive of the omission (comp. Col. i. 1). The humility is all the more genuine, that it comes out thus silently and unconstrained.

2. **To the church.**—Paul writes not to the presbyters, teachers, &c., but to the churches; where he names the office-bearers, it is by way of supplementary appendage (Phil. i. 1).* In the most solemn

* [According to Luther's more exact rendering of v. 22. —J. L.]

† [Ellicott: "as being probably the older man, and certainly the older associate of St. Paul." Alford urges rather the personal and official eminence of Silas.—J. L.]

‡ [By no means. Paul is the sole author, and would be so understood; see 1 Thess. ii. 18; iii. 1, 2, 5, 6; 2 Thess. ii. 5; iii. 17. Comp. 1 Cor., Phil., and Philem., in each of which Epistles the Apostle associates a companion with himself in the salutation, and then immediately proceeds throughout in the first person singular. Comp. also the Epistle to the Galatians, where it can scarcely be supposed that the writer meant to ascribe joint authorship to "all the brethren" of ch. i. 2.—J. L.]

* [After citing various explanations of the special mention of "the bishops and deacons" in Phil. i. 1, Eadie

manner he requires, ch. v. 27, that all the brethren should read the Epistle. To deny the reading of Holy Scripture to the laity, therefore, is to contravene its original destination. In his earlier Epistles (to the *Thessalonians*, *Galatians*, and *Corinthians*) Paul writes τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ or ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις; in the later ones (*Romans*, *Ephesians*, *Philippians*, *Colossians*) τοῖς ἁγίοις, &c., which indeed is added in those to the Corinthians.*

3. **In God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.**—These words are to be closely joined with τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, as if they were preceded by τῇ or τῇ οὔσῃ, as in the opening of 1 and 2 Cor., where it is said, only in reverse order: τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ (comp. 1 Thess. ii. 14). The addition attached by means of the preposition forms here, in fact (comp. Winer, p. 123), with the substantive but one main idea, and is to be connected with it merely by the voice. This happens with special frequency in the case of the Pauline formula: ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, to which our expression is nearly allied (comp., in particular, Phil. i. 1: τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Φιλίπποις, also Col. i. 2). Thus the want of the article intimates that it belongs to the idea of the Church, to be in God and Christ. "Est hæc nota veluti approbatio veræ et legitimæ ecclesiæ" (CALVIN). In this very brevity of the expression is something great and profound. It denotes not merely fellowship with God (BENGEL, LÜNEMANN), but a real, essential being in God and Christ (Rom. xvi. 11; John xv. 4; xvii. 21 sqq.; 1 John ii. 5 sq.; v. 20). "It is a high dignity, to which nothing is equal, when one is in God" (CHRYSOSTOM). Whereas Thessalonica previously lay with the whole world in the wicked one (ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ masc., 1 John v. 19; comp. ver. 18; ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ opposed to ver. 20)—whereas in that place there were only Jews, who had no part in Christ, and Gentiles, who had none also in God—there is at this time a church there, that is in God the Father, and in Christ Jesus. Here is a miracle of God, over which the Apostle gives Him glory and thanks; as always at the beginning of his Epistles, when he turns his eye on the churches, so also here, ver. 2.

4. **Grace unto you** [German: **Grace** be **with you.**—J. L.], **and peace.** The old epistolary style combines in the inscription what with us is distributed into the address, salutation, subscription, and direction. The Pauline benediction is χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη; only in the Epistles to Timothy (and perhaps Tit. i. 4) χάρις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη; the first form also in 1 and 2 Peter, the latter in 2 John; Jude 2: ἔλεος καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη. Χάρις reminds us of the Greek salutation χαίρειν (comp. Acts xxiii. 26), which occurs also in the apostolic circular (Acts v. [xv.] 23; James i. 1); εἰρήνη, of the Hebrew (likewise Arabic, see WINER, *Realwörterbuch: Höflichkeit*) form of salutation and benediction, שָׁלוֹם (Gen. xliii. 23; Judg. xix. 20; 1 Chron. xii. 18; Ex. xviii. 7; Judg. xviii. 15 1 Sam. x. 4; xxv. 5, 6). As James in a lively manner connects, ch. i. 2, χαρά with the χαίρειν, so Paul has given it a turn of yet deeper Christian import in χάρις, while the εἰρήνη ὑμῖν had already by the Saviour or His return from death been brought to a Christian maturity and depth (John xx. 19, 21, 26; comp. also Luke x. 5, 6), especially in connection with His farewell discourse, in which He had promised, as the fruit of His victory over the world, and so as a distinctive family legacy in opposition to the world, to bequeathe His peace to His own (John xiv. 27; xvi. 33). By their juxtaposition both words are raised completely out of their Gentile and Jewish outward significance, as referring almost solely to the natural life and welfare, into the "fulness of the peculiar salvation and blessing of Christians." A notable instance of the way in which the New Testament dialect was formed.—Χάρις is, first of all, *favor* generally, *kindness*, especially towards inferiors, the ἀγάπη in self-manifestation (just as righteousness is holiness in self-manifestation), and in this sense it is used also of the child Jesus, Luke ii. 40: χάρις θεοῦ ἦν ἐπ' αὐτό. But in a more special sense χάρις denotes (opposed to ὀφείλημα, νόμος, ἔργα, Rom. iv. 4; vi. 14 sq.; xi. 6) the exhibition of the Divine love as free and undeserved in regard to such, as have not merely no legal claim to it, but have according to law deserved the opposite (Rom. iii. 23, 24; Eph. ii. 3–5). This is the New Testament saving grace, which in Christ Jesus has appeared to sinners (Tit. ii. 11; John i. 17). It is not merely the principle of the redemption accomplished once for all, but it continues also to be the sustaining ground, the nourishing power of the new spiritual life with its manifold gifts in Christians (comp. Acts xxiii. 11 [no doubt a misprint for xi. 23]; vi. 8; Eph. iv. 7), and so is ever afresh inwardly sealed and communicated to them from God in Christ through the Holy Ghost (comp. Rom. v. 5; John i. 16). In this sense, according to which grace is thus not simply a sentiment, but at the same time a Divine self-communication, Paul desires for his readers ever fresh grace from God and Christ. Εἰρήνη need not be taken, with DE WETTE, MEYER, &c., against the Greek and New Testament usage, as = salvation, but with most since CHRYSOSTOM, who on this point as a Greek has a special voice, as = peace. This is the immediate effect of grace in the heart of man, the restoration, after the distraction and discord of the life of sin, of the harmony of the inner life, with its pure enjoyment, resting on the fact that the oppression and curse of sin are removed from the conscience, and man knows that in Christ he is brought again into his true relation to God, the filial relation (Rom. v. 1), and is thereby comforted and strengthened against the oppositions and vexations of the world (John xvi. 33). The enhancement of this peace, when it pours its quickening and elevating influence into the experience, is joy (χαρά, Rom. xiv. 17; Phil. iv. 4; John xv. 11; xvi. 22, 24; xvii. 13; 1 John i. 4; 1 Pet. i. 8—a fundamental idea of the New Testament, too much neglected by us in life and doctrine). Peace being the feeling of convalescence and healthfulness of the new life, the home-feeling of the returned prodigal, it impels the man of itself to abide in the healthful life-element of home; it has a power to keep the heart and mind, the whole mechanism of the inner life, in Christ Jesus (Phil. iv. 7), and is therefore suitable in every relation as a chief benediction for Christians.

adds: "The opinion of Wiesinger is at least as probable, that the real reason is to be found in the circumstances of the church, and that there was a tendency to undue assumption on the part of some individuals, which needed such an effective check as was implied in the special acknowledgment of those who bore office in it."—J. L.]

* [ELLICOTT: "The variation is slightly noticeable; it does not however seem to point to gradually altered views with regard to the attributes of the church (Jowett), but merely to the present comparative paucity of numbers (compare Chrysost.), and their aggregation in a single assembly." And the same considerations may perhaps account for the fact that only in these two earliest Epistles does Paul address the church as composed of persons belonging to the city, and not as established *in* the city itself. Comp. Col. iv. 16.—J. L.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Of the natural world these two things are true: In God we live, move, and are [Luther's version: *sind* = ἐσμέν.—J. L.], all things harmoniously existing in the Logos (Acts xvii. 25–28; Col. i. 17); and: The whole world lieth in the wicked one (1 John v. 19). The original Divine powers of creation and the superadded powers of the prince of this world, life and death, intermingle therein in a mysterious manner. Through Christ this mixture is dissolved, and the separation, the great judgment of the world, is effected, whereby the Satanic element is cast out, and the world brought back again to its original ground of life (John xii. 31; Col. i. 20). It is in His own person first of all, the person of the Son of man who has entered through death into His glory, that the world's judgment is fulfilled, that which is of the devil is rightfully abolished, and humanity introduced anew to God. Whosoever would again live wholly in God must be in Him. But this new being and life unites itself to the world first inwardly in the spirit. As therefore all creatures in respect of their natural existence, that is, so far as they live generally in the world of death and corruption, live, move, and are in God and immediately in the Logos, drawing continually from His omnipresent, all-pervading energy the breath of life, so Christians, in respect of their inner, pneumatic, incorruptible existence, are and live first of all *in Jesus Christ*, the glorified, who being the Lord is also the Spirit * as God (2 Cor. iii. 17), and so the Head and all-pervading life-principle of the Church born of His Spirit (Col. i. 18; ii. 6, 7; Eph. i. 22 sq.; ii. 21 sq.), the element in which Christians live, as the branches in the vine (John xv. 4 sqq.), so that all they do is done in Christ Jesus (Col. iii. 17, and the phrase, occurring more than a hundred times with Paul, ἐν Χριστῷ or ἐν κυρίῳ). Because in Christ, they are then also, in this higher sense of the spiritual, eternal life, *in God* (1 Cor. iii. 23; xi. 3; John xiv. 20). Thus in the Church is a beginning made towards the attainment of the great, Divine purpose in the world, again organically to comprehend the whole in Christ and in God (Eph. i. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 28).—[WEBSTER and WILKINSON: The full significancy of this important preposition ἐν, in its N. T. use with Θεῷ, Ἰησοῦ, Χριστῷ, Κυρίῳ, can only be understood by realizing the all-pervading doctrine of the Holy Ghost.—J. L.]

2. It is of doctrinal significance, that ἐκκλησία denotes as well the universal, as the individual or local, church. The distinction between congregation and church [*Gemeinde und Kirche*] does not exist in the New Testament usage. Not merely a philological exactness, but one of Luther's genial instincts must be recognized in his having preserved this identity of expression, and everywhere in the New Testament translated ἐκκλησία by *Gemeinde* [congregation]. Spirit is, according to Oetinger's word, where every part can again become a whole. The same is true also of the place of the Spirit's manifestation, the Church. The Apostles, anxious as they were for the order of single churches (Acts xiv. 23; Tit. i. 5), made no arrangement before their departure for securing the external unity of the Church, which till then had rested in their persons. From this fact, which has not yet been sufficiently considered, we perceive two things: 1. That the Church can be one in the Spirit, even where there is a separation of outward communions; 2. that we should make moderate account of the Church as an institution. The New Testament has no word for *churchly*.*

3. "Nothing speaks more strongly for the *Divinity of Christ* than the practice, which pervades the whole style of Scripture, of joining Christ with God, and ascribing to Him strictly Divine operations." OLSHAUSEN on Rom. i. 7. There is everywhere in the New Testament, even in the Synoptical Gospels, a multitude of indirect evidences for the Divinity of Christ, modes of speech which can only on this supposition be understood in their full, natural sense. Christologies which recognize in the Redeemer merely the sinless, supernaturally begotten, eternally ordained central Man (SCHLEIERMACHER, ROTHE, SCHENKEL), have in them important elements of truth, but do not ascend to the biblical height. In the inscriptions of the Pauline Epistles Father and Son are joined together as Θεὸς πατήρ, with and without ἡμῶν, and κύριος (again with and without ἡμῶν) Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. Now it might be supposed, especially on account of the ἡμῶν common to both, that πατήρ and κύριος answer to one another, the former expression derived from the family, the latter from the state and kingdom; or the former from the filial relation, the latter from that of a servant (comp. Mal. i. 6 and the frequent δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). But both the verbal arrangement and the decisive passage 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6 (comp. 1 Cor. xii. 5, 6; Eph. iv. 5, 6) show that the correspondence is rather between Θεός and κύριος, πατήρ and Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. And this reminds us that the LXX. put κύριος for יְהוָֹה (in conformity with the oral אֲדֹנָי†) and Θεός for אֱלֹהִים (comp. also John xx. 28 and 2 John 3, where to κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός is still added, with a specific relation to the πατήρ, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρός). Thus the appellation κύριος also becomes a witness for Christ's Divinity, as NITZSCH has particularly pointed out. (Cfr. his article on the essential trinity of God, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1841, p. 322 sqq., and *System der christl. Lehre*, 5th ed., p. 145, 189.) The peculiarity of the designation of Christ as κύριος is, that therein the Divine essence (κύριος = יְהוָֹה) and the historical, official position and operation (κύριος κυριεύων, Rom. xiv. 9, Lord and King of the kingdom of God, on which account ἡμῶν is easily subjoined) are combined in one. The latter signification evolves itself in the Gospels by various steps and deepening shades of meaning from the dialect of common life, where κύριος as applied to Jesus is scarcely any longer an

* [HODGE: "Not one and the same person, but one and the same Being, in the same sense in which our Lord says: 'I and the Father are one.' It is an identity of essence and of power."—J. L.]

* [German: *dass man von der Kirche als Institution mässiglich halten soll. Das Neue Testament hat kein Wort für kirchlich.* Nor has the N. T. any word for *evangelical, trinitarian*, &c. The logic of this second inference, from which I beg leave to express my dissent, is quite as feeble, as its spirit would seem to be at variance with that of the N. T. throughout. It is surely of the Church as an institution that Christ speaks in Matt. xvi. 18; xviii. 17; and Paul, for example, in Eph. iv. 4–13; 1 Tim. iii. 15; &c. Nor is there any good reason why we should shrink from acknowledging, that whatever plausibility there may be in this sort of indifferentism, which is indeed common enough, in regard to the outward constitution of the Church, is derived, not at all from the N. T., but from the historical, and, alas, still seemingly helpless, confusions of Christendom.—J. L.]

† [Substituted by the Jews in the reading of the Scriptures for יְהוָֹה.—J. L.]

ordinary word of courtesy, but, as in the sphere of revelation generally, every *nomen* again becomes *omen*, a reverential address to One whose *essential* superiority is recognized, as well as his possession of a miraculous power (John iv. 11, 15, 19; Matt. viii. 2, 6, 8, 21, 25; xvii. 4; xx. 30, 31; xxii. 43–45; xxv. 37, 44; xxvii. 10; John vi. 68; ix. 36, 38; xiii. 6, 13 sq.; xx. 13, 28; xxi. 7; comp. Acts ii. 36; x. 36), whereas on the other hand the deeper, Jehovistic-Messianic usage of the Apostles, especially of Paul, is found employed at the very beginning, among the links of connection with the Old Testament, by the angel Gabriel (Luke i. 16, 17, and so accordingly vv. 43, 76; comp. also Matt. vii. 21, 22; Acts vii. 59; ix. 13, 14). In the Book of Acts the expressions ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ and ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου are used interchangeably (ch. iv. 31; vi. 2, 7; viii. 14; xvii. 13, &c.; viii. 25; xiii. 48 sq.; xv. 35 sq.; xix. 10, 20). In this higher use of the word it is clearly implied, that Christ attained His central position as Lord and Head of the Church, of humanity, of the world, only by means of His Divinity. But certainly there is in it also an expression of the distinctive character of His Divinity, to wit, of subordination rightly understood—the Father being the Supreme God over all, and so also the God of Christ (Eph. i. 17; John xx. 17; Rev. iii. 12), but the Son God as manifested, mediating, standing on the pinnacle of the world (Eph. iv. 5, 6; 1 Cor. xii. 5, 6). God, Lord, Spirit, are the trinitarian expressions of Paul; Father, Son, Spirit, those of the Evangelists, of the Lord, and of John.—That God, the Most High, is our Father, who loves us, and to whom we should draw near with filial confidence, and that Jesus Christ is our Lord and Jehovah, who as Man draws near to us as Saviour—this truth meets the readers of Paul's Epistles at the very outset, full of grace and peace.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Paul and his friends a model of Christian fellowship: 1. Generally of brethren with one another; 2. of teachers with one another (Paul and Silas, comp. Acts xvi. 17); 3. of teachers and scholars (Paul and Timothy). The brotherly fellowship of teachers laboring in a church, as a main condition of blessed working: 1. The personal fellowship of spirit; 2. the fellowship of doctrine; 3. that of prayer and intercession (comp. v. 2 and 2 Thess. i 3, 11).—Christian brotherhood and Christian friendship, their oneness and their difference, shown in the relation of Paul to his fellow-laborers and especially to Timothy.—Rieger: In the kingdom of Christ even the most highly-gifted person does not choose to be so alone, nor alone to perform everything, but gladly seizes occasion to support his own witness to the truth, and mode of acting therein, by the consent of others. In this way likewise a man can really well commend himself to the consciences of others, when they perceive in him a willingness to let others also stand beside him as his equals.

Believers should regard themselves as those who are in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. Comp. Tersteegen's: "All-pervading Air, wherein we ever move, of all things principle and life, &c." [Comp. Acts xvii. 28.—J. L.]—Roos: Civil societies have their ground in an external force and a temporary expediency; a Christian church has its everlasting ground in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, who is acknowledged and adored in common.—Diedrich: Nowadays in most countries one knows only of churches on a merely natural foundation.—The great joy, which the Apostle always proclaims to his readers at the beginning of his Epistles, that God is our Father and Jesus Christ our Divine Lord.

The two vital points [*Herzpunkte*] of Christianity: 1. In the heart of God, and from Him, grace; 2. in the heart of man, and from him in the church, peace.—Thomas Aquinas: *χάρις principium omnis boni, εἰρήνη finale bonorum omnium.*—Phil. Matth. Hahn: We have daily need of fresh emanations of grace and peace from the highest source. 1. The emanations of God's grace are innumerable: forgiveness of sins; the witness of the Spirit, that we are the children of God; light and life-power from the word. 2. Every new effluence of grace gives also new peace within the heart, since in full assurance of the Holy Ghost we know that we have not to fear God's wrath on account of our former sins, and that the impending day of wrath will not consume us (see on Col. i. 2; Eph. i. 2).

[Anselm, cited by Pelt and Alford: "*Gratia et pax a Deo sit vobis*, ut, qui humana gratia et sæculari pace privati estis, apud Deum gratiam et pacem habeatis."—J. L.]

FIRST PART.

PERSONAL AND HISTORICAL.

Ch. I. 2—Ch. III. 13.

I.

Paul shows the Thessalonians the genuineness of his preaching and of their faith.

(Ch. I. 2—Ch. II. 16.)

Chapter I. 2–7.

The Apostle thanks God for the gracious standing of the Thessalonians (v. 2), which he describes in its human manifestation (v. 3), as well as its Divine ground (v. 4). The latter is their election, to be inferred from the fact, that the Gospel was, on the one hand, preached amongst them with power (v. 5), and, on the other hand, was received by them with joy, so as to furnish an example to others (vv. 6, 7).

2 We give thanks to God always for you all, making mention of you[1] in our
3 prayers; remembering without ceasing[2] your work of faith, and labor [toil,
κόπου] of love, and patience of hope in [of][3] our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight
of [before, ἔμπροσθεν] God and our Father [our God and Father, τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς
4 ἡμῶν]; knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God [brethren beloved of
5 God, your election][4]; for [because, ὅτι] our gospel came not unto you[5] in word
only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in [Sin. omits this ἐν] much
assurance; as [even as, καθώς] ye know what manner of men we were [proved
6 were found][6] among you [for ἐν ὑμῖν Sin. has simply ὑμῖν] for your sake; and ye became
followers [imitators, μιμηταί] of us and of the Lord, having received the word in
7 much affliction, with joy of the Holy Ghost; so that ye were [became, γενέσθαι]
ensamples [a pattern][7] to all that believe [all the believers][8] in Macedonia and
[in] Achaia.[9]

[1] V. 2.—ὑμῶν after μνείαν is, indeed, wanting in A. B. [Sin.] &c., but by Tischendorf, who, with Lachmann, formerly cancelled it, it has been rightly resumed on preponderating evidence, external and internal. On account of the ὑμῶν before μνείαν it might easily drop out of the manuscripts.

[2] V. 3.—[For a different construction of ἀδιαλείπτως, adopted by our Authors, see the Exegetical Notes.—J. L.]

[3] V. 3.—[Comp. ch. v. 8; Rom. v. 2; Tit. i. 2; iii. 7. And so here the older English versions, and very many others. See the Exegetical Notes, and the *Revision*.—J. L.]

[4] V. 4.—[This construction of εἰδότες, ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ θεοῦ (Sin: τοῦ θεοῦ) τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν, is that of the oldest versions (Syriac and Vulgate), and may be said to be now universally adopted. King James' Revisers erred here in quitting Tyndale and Cranmer to follow Geneva and the Bishops' Bible. Comp. 2 Thess. ii. 13; Rom. i. 7; Sept. Deut. xxxiii. 12; Sir. xlv. 1; xlvi. 13.—The reason for the change of the punctuation at the close of vv. 4 and 5 will be found in the exegesis.—J. L.]

[5] V. 5.—εἰς ὑμᾶς, Griesbach, Lachmann, Lünemann: πρὸς ὑμᾶς. [Sin. inserts τοῦ θεοῦ after εὐαγγέλιον.—J. L.]

[6] V. 5.—[ἐγενήθημεν. Comp. 2 Cor. vii. 14. Here Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva: *behaved ourselves*; Auberlen: *uns erwiesen* (and similarly in the other two instances in vv. 5, 6); and many other versions to the same effect. In the New Testament the first aorist passive forms of γίνομαι (see Phrynichus, ed. Lobeck, pp. 108-9) occur 36 times, and, while in 14 instances our English version treats them as simply equivalent to a past tense of εἶναι, it is not difficult to detect a different shade of meaning in every one of them. See the *Revision* on this verse, Notes s. and w. In the present context Alford lays (Ellicott thinks an undue) stress on the passive forms as suggestive of Divine efficiency;* and so Wordsworth: "*were made* by God's grace."—J. L.]

[7] V. 7.—τύπον; *Recepta*, defended by Reiche: τύπους. [The singular is edited by Knapp, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth, Ellicott—the last-named, however, admitting that the plural form is supported by better external authority—A. C. F. G. K. L.; to which must now be added Sin.—For the translation, comp. Tit. ii. 7 and Heb. viii. 5.—J. L.]

[8] V. 7.—[πᾶσιν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν:—"πιστ. not having here a pure participial force, . . but, as often in the N. T. coalescing with the article to form a substantive." Ellicott.—J. L.]

[9] V. 7.—[Most critical editions repeat the ἐν before τῇ 'Αχαΐᾳ, with nearly all the uncial manuscripts, including Sin.—Here, and in v. 8, Μακεδονίᾳ is in Sin. Μακαιδ.—J. L.]

* [In his last edition ALFORD gives up this point.—J. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. (V. 2.) **We give thanks.**—With such a thanksgiving for the faith of his readers, or rather an assurance that he is always giving thanks on that account, Paul begins all his Epistles to churches (and also 2 Timothy and Philemon), with the exception of that to the Galatians, where he sets out with a characteristic θαυμάζω. What God has done and continues to do in sinners appears to him ever afresh great and worthy of praise, nor does he even allow himself to be disconcerted in his thanksgiving by the many faults and imperfections still adhering to the churches, while on the other hand by testifying his thankful joy in his readers, every one of whom is to understand that he himself is included therein (πάντων), he opens his way to their hearts. But *pro gratulatione gratiarum actionem ponit, ut Dei beneficium esse admoneat, quicquid prædicat esse in ipsis laude dignum* (CALVIN).—The plural, found here and 2 Thessalonians and Colossians, is not the literary *We* (PELT, [CONYBEARE,] &c., contrary to 1 Corinthians, Philippians, Philemon, &c., but includes Silvanus and Timothy (comp. ch. ii. 18).* As the three men preach and write together, so also they pray together. Excellently DE WETTE: "In other cases the Epistles begin with such declarations of thankfulness only by way of preamble, and so that soon a special object of the Epistle is announced; but here the thanksgiving is connected with a good deal that the Apostle feels himself impelled to write to the young church respecting its condition, and his own relation to it; and this forms a principal part of the Epistle, if not its main substance." The Apostle gives thanks for the Christian standing of his readers, and to confirm them therein, and remove all doubt of its Divine reality, as well as of the purity of the motives with which he himself had led them into their position, is really, strictly speaking, his object in chh. i.—iii.

2. **Making mention of you.**—That μνείαν ποιούμ. supplies the particular explanation, or modal definition, to εὐχαρ.: "*whilst* we make mention of you," is clear; and equally so that εἰδότες, v. 4, supplies a causal definition: Paul thanks God for the Thessalonians, *because* he knows their election. But it is a question, whether the intermediate participle is to be made parallel to the first or the third. The former view is adopted by most, and then at first sight a beautiful parallel results: μνημονεύοντες answers to the μνείαν ποιούμ., the ὑμῶν is extended in ὑμῶν τοῦ ἔργου—'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν, &c. returns in ἔμπροσθεν—πατρὸς ἡμῶν. But the parallelism is only too strong, and amounts to tautology; the first clause were of no account alongside of the second. We shall, therefore, do

* [So commentators generally in this instance. WORDSWORTH's remark, however, is worthy of note, that the *we* of these earliest Epistles is in those of later date exchanged for the first person singular *I*. JOWETT also refers it exclusively to Paul.—J. L.]

better (with CHRYSOSTOM, CALVIN, SCHOTT, KOCH), by taking *μνημον.* as parallel to *εἰδότες*, and finding in v. 3 the first, and in v. 4 the second, ground assigned for the thanksgiving. In favor of this, also, is the analogy of Col. i. 4 and 2 Thess i. 3. To thanksgiving for the Thessalonians the Apostle is impelled on the human side by his remembrance of their work of faith, &c.; on the divine side, by his reasonable conviction of their election.*

3. (V. 2 [3].) **Without ceasing.**—*Ἀδιαλείπτως* is by the Peschito, Vulgate, LUTHER, BENGEL, EWALD, and many others [BENSON, BURTÓN, BLOOMFIELD, ALFORD, WEBSTER and WILKINSON, &c.—J. L.], rightly construed with what precedes; and for this the analogy of ch. ii. 13; Rom. i. 9; comp. 2 Tim. i. 3, is decisive. The word, moreover, is used by Paul in only one other place, 1 Thess. v. 17, and thus always in connection with prayer. Nor does the word so arranged drag (LÜNEMANN); rather it is distinguished, and *πάντοτε* thereby receives its special illustration. The Apostle would certify the Thessalonians with peculiar emphasis that they are constantly in his devotional remembrance. On the other hand, *μνημονεύοντες* does not in this way become flat (DE WETTE), but is just as marked and forcible as the parallel *εἰδότες* at the head of the clause.†

4. (V. 3.) **For we are mindful [Remembering].**—*Μνημονεύειν* is not merely transitive = *μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι*, *to mention*, *bring to remembrance* (DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN, &c.‡), but it also means, and indeed primarily, to be mindful (*μνήμων*), as *κυριεύειν*, *δουλεύειν* = *κύριος*, *δοῦλος εἶναι*. Thus everywhere in Paul's writings, and generally in the New Testament; whence arises a new proof in favor of our view of v. 3 (though, even taken intransitively, the word might be understood of remembrance in prayer).—Paul remembers what he himself has seen at Thessalonica, and what Timothy has since reported to him (ch. iii. 6). He goes on to speak in unusually strong terms of the excellencies of the Thessalonians, as in the second chapter he has to commend his own ministry. In this there is neither flattery nor egotism; nor is it simply even a father's joy in the young church, that puts such words in his mouth. He is rather "exhibiting evidences to the Thessalonians, that they had attained to a genuine faith, and that there is in them a true work of God" (J. MICH. HAHN).

5. **Your work in [of] faith.**—*Ὑμῶν* is to be connected with the following substantives, and that in such a way that its force extends over all the three main ideas.—It is, then, of three things that Paul is mindful, and this threefoldness he defines according to the three fundamental elements of the Christian life, which he so often extols: faith, love, hope (comp. ch. v. 8; 1 Cor. xiii. 13; Col. i. 4 sq.). But here these occur only in a subordinate, genitival way. And the genitives are all of the same sort: genitives of the origin (DE WETTE, SCHOTT, and most);* they mark the feeling that produces *ἔργον*, *κόπος*, *ὑπομονή*, showing itself practically therein. In German we should best employ compound substantives: *Glaubenswerk*, *Liebesmühe* [faith-work, love-toil], were this kind of phrase possible in the last instance. Now in this way also may be explained the only one of these expressions that is difficult, and has been very variously understood: *τὸ ἔργον τῆς πίστεως*, with which comp. 2 Thess. i. 11. Here *ἔργον*, as parallel to *κόπος*, cannot denote a single work, but is something continuous, a totality, like our day's-work, life-work. And so *ἔργον* is already found also in classical Greek = business, occupation; it denotes every human activity, especially in so far as it displays a free energetic movement, or is connected with toil and effort (Passow). In the New Testament and with Paul the word stands repeatedly for a man's whole life-work, the sum of his *ἔργα*, as it is sometimes said that God judges according to works, at other times according to every one's work (comp., for instance, Rom. i. [ii.] 6 with 1 Pet. i. 17; Rev. xx. 12 with ch. xxii. 12). *Τὸ ἔργον τῆς πίστεως* is thus a course of action, with the accessory idea of vigor, strength, as proceeding from faith; the resolute, serious authentication of faith; practical earnestness in Christianity (comp. for the expression *τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου*, Rom. ii. 15, in which only the genitival relation is somewhat different; whereas the material parallel cited by DE WETTE and others, Gal. v. 6: *πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη*, is in so far less apt, as it confounds the second particular, the *κόπος τῆς ἀγάπης*, with the first). To the later Pauline usage, formed in connection with the doctrine of justification, our expression stands as yet in no direct, conscious relation; but in reality it forms a double antithesis to the *ἔργα νόμου*, since faith and law stand mutually opposed (Rom. iv. 13 sqq.; Gal. iii. 23 sqq.), and so the singular *τὸ ἔργον* to the anarthrous plural—the undivided unity of the spiritually quickened life-work to the incoherent multiplicity of single, more or less external, works and performances. For the thought, such passages may be compared as Col. i. 10; Eph. ii. 10, and especially Tit. iii. 8 (*καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι οἱ πεπιστευκότες θεῷ*); ch. ii. 14, 7; i. 16; 1 Tim. ii. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 21; iii. 17. As Paul has the expression *τὸ ἔργον τῆς πίστεως* in his two earliest Epistles, so his latest, the Pastoral Epistles, insist with peculiar earnestness on the evidencing of faith in good works. Herein moreover lie hints for the reconciliation of Paul with James. After what has been said, we can now readily estimate the divergent explanations. It is a mistake, were it only on account of the analogy with what follows, to take *τῆς πίστεως*, nearly in the sense of

* [ELLICOTT, who takes the other view of *μνημονεύοντες*, as being parallel to the preceding *μνείαν ποιούμ.*, would distinguish the three participial clauses thus: "The first serves principally to define the *manner*, the second the *time* and circumstances, the third the *reasons* and motives of the action."—J. L.]

† [All this fails to satisfy me that the construction of our English version should not be retained. The whole sentence is thus better balanced. Paul having assured the Thessalonians that he was always thanking God for them, it was much less important to add immediately that he made continual mention of them in his prayers, than that the *continual remembrance* of their Christian character and its fruits was the reason why his reference to them in his prayers *always took the form of thanksgiving* to God. The other texts cited cannot control a sentence of different structure. ELLICOTT also adheres to this arrangement as "*far more natural*," and refers in its behalf to Chrysostom and the other Greek commentators.—J. L.]

‡ [This meaning, which BEZA here introduced (*commemorantes*), and which ALFORD has lately adopted: *making mention of* (though in his *New Testament for English Readers*, published in the same year as the last edition of the Greek Testament—1865—he follows the Common Version, *remembering*), is borne by the word, out of 21 instances of its occurrence in the New Testament, only at Heb. xi. 22, and there the construction is different.—J. L.]

* [ELLICOTT is inclined to make them simply *possessive* genitives, and *ἔργου*, *κόπου*. *ὑπομονῆς* the prevailing features and characteristics of *πίστεως*, *ἀγάπης*, *ἐλπίδος*, respectively. But the two ideas are in this case essentially one—at least inseparable in fact;—the former *belonging to* the latter as modes of *self-manifestation*.—J. L.]

John vi. 29, as a genitive of apposition [Hofmann, Alford]: the work, that consists in faith; whether, indeed, we understand this, with Calvin and Calov, of faith as a mighty operation of God in man, or, with Clericus and Macknight, of the reception of the Gospel as man's work, so far as that involves, for example, the subduing of prejudices. It is also erroneous, because resting on an indistinct conception of the ἔργον and of the genitival relation, and likewise as violating the analogy with what follows, and encroaching in the third member, to lay the chief stress, with Chrysostom, Theodoret, Pelt, Lünemann (though he rightly says that ἔργου is emphatic), and others, on πίστεως: faith, something begun with energy, and in spite of all temptations steadfastly retained. Rightly Anselm: *quomodo fides vestra non est otiosa, sed semper bonum opus gignit;* De Wette: moral activity, proceeding from faith; and similarly Bengel, Olshausen, &c.

[At 2 Thess. i. 11 Dr. Riggenbach would modify the above explanation of ἔργον τῆς πίστεως by limiting the expression to the inward work of faith in the soul itself, and cites Rom. iv. 20, 21 as a better parallel than Gal. v. 6. An obvious objection to this is, that what Paul had *observed* of the faith of the Thessalonians, and what he now *remembered* of it, could only have been its outward manifestations in the life, not its internal operation in the heart. And just so in regard to their love and hope.—J. L.]

6. **Toil in [of] love.**—["Such as their own Jason had shown amid persecutions, in Acts xvii." Jowett.—J. L.]—The first expression bears on the relation to God, the second on that to the Christian brethren (comp. Col. i. 4), the third on that to the world and its persecutions. The governing substantives advance from the active to the passive: ἔργον is vigorous doing, ὑπομονή patient suffering, κόπος forms the transition: toil is a doing combined with suffering; strenuous, fatiguing, devoted labor. Patience is the last and highest; rightly to suffer is more and harder than rightly to work; even in the case of the Lord suffering was the last, decisive test, and became the means of His perfecting and glorification (comp. 1 Pet. iv. 14). In these three, then, are shown and verified faith, love, hope—the root, stem, and crown of the new life. Faith lays hold of the grace exhibited in the facts of redemption, and is thus the foundation of Christian life, the reimplanting of man through Christ in God. Thence arises love as the echo and answer to the Divine love in the heart of man; it is the pure opposite of selfishness—that principle of sin—and so is the soul of the Christian life, and of the present Christian fellowship—the fulfilling of the law. Hope knows that the future belongs to the Lord and His Church; it is the real expectation and sure prospect, that the pneumatic life, which now already, descending from the Lord, dwells in his members, shall outwardly also penetrate and transfigure all things, and subdue its still existing antagonists, the flesh and the world, by means of new revelations of the Lord. Thus, in these three subjective factors of the new life is reflected at the same time the historical character of the objective kingdom of God.—With regard to the Thessalonians, therefore, Paul rejoices first of all in the vigor and earnestness of their life of faith, in that they have not yet become faint, and then in the fact that during this hard time, when their church is exposed to manifold vexations, they not merely in a general way hold together in mutual love, but also with laborious effort and sacrifice come to one another's help—*in beneficiis spiritualibus vel externis* (Bengel). Comp. the examples, Acts xvii. 5, 9; Rom. xvi. 4, 12; 1 John iii. 16.—With this is connected finally

7. (V. 3.) **Patience in [of] hope.** Ὑπομονή, properly the staying under (under the cross), patient, unwearied constancy in suffering; here in persecution (see Acts xvii. 5 sqq.). This constancy proceeds from hope, because in view of the future glory one can the more cheerfully bear the present suffering (Rom. viii. 18; 2 Cor. iv. 17 sq.; Heb. xi. 26; xii. 2 sq.). Patience, therefore, appears as the inseparable companion of hope (Rom. viii. 25); likewise, in the reverse order, as producing it, for in the spiritual life there exists a reciprocal influence (Rom. v. 3 sq.); or it even takes the place of hope beside faith and love (Tit. ii. 2; comp. 2 Tim. iii. 10; 1 Tim. vi. 11).—τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ refers not to all the three preceding virtues as derived from Christ (Olshausen, [Steiger, on 1 Pet. i. 2, Wordsworth, Webster and Wilkinson]), nor yet to ὑπομονή (Bengel, after 2 Thess. iii. 5), but to ἐλπίδος as a genitive, not of apposition (Luther), but of the object. Christ is the proper object of hope (and as such is certainly Himself also called ἡ ἐλπίς, Col. i. 27; 1 Tim. i. 1), not only because on Him all our trust (this the more common meaning of ἐλπίς) rests, but especially because it is through His return and the revelation of the Kingdom of God therewith connected, that the Christian's hope of glory is fulfilled (Tit. ii. 13). Let it be observed, how by the addition of this genitive the element of hope, so important in our Epistles, already appears here in a fuller and more emphatic way than the other two.*

8. **Before our God and Father.**—Ἡμῶν belongs to both substantives.† The words ἔμπροσθεν, &c., may be joined either with the verb μνημονεύοντες (De Wette, Olshausen, [Lünemann, Alford, Ellicott], &c.), or with the three substantives, τοῦ ἔργου, &c. (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Œcumenius [Bishop Hall, Jowett, Wordsworth]). Even in the first case μνημον. need not be understood of mention in prayer, but that Paul before God, that is, so often as he comes before God in prayer, remembers their work of faith, &c.; that is the ground of his thanksgiving; comp. ch. iii. 9, a parallel passage that favors this view. But opposed to it is the verbal arrangement, since ἔμπροσθεν, &c. would in this way drag; and the other connection, which no more than ἐν θεῷ, v. 1, requires the article to be repeated (against Lünemann), might be preferable.‡ By this means the entire conduct of the Thessalonians is put in relation to God (comp. ch. iii. 13), as v. 4 will presently describe in turn God's bearing towards them. Chrysostom [Wordsworth]: "Since no man praised or rewarded what they did, therefore Paul adds these words, as if he would say: Be of good cheer, you suffer in the presence of God."

9. (V. 4.) **Knowing.**—Εἰδότες is thus parallel with μνημονεύοντες, v. 3; comp. the note on that word. Paul makes the two participles emphatic by

* [The above definition of the hope, as having immediate reference to Christ's second coming (comp. v. 10), is given by very many of the best interpreters, from Ambrosiaster to Alford and Ellicott.—J. L.]

† [So the Dutch version, Conybeare, Peile, Jowett, &c. The other construction, however, is in this case grammatically allowable. Ellicott rather prefers it; see his note on Gal. i. 4.—J. L.]

‡ [Dr. Riggenbach's Preface indicates a preference for the connection with μνημονεύοντες.—J. L.]

placing them in the front. By the side of the remembrance of what actually lay before his eyes, he sets the knowledge, the firm assurance of something, of which one cannot be so easily certain, and in this way he intimates so much the more strongly, that on this point he is sure of his ground. To an afflicted person no higher comfort can be given, than when it is allowed to say to him: I *know* that thou art chosen.—With this also agrees the address: *brethren beloved of God* (ἠγαπημένοι, perfect participle: embraced once for all by the Divine love): they are permitted to regard themselves as objects of the Divine love, of electing love; they are to know that their Christianity is not a human dream and vapor, but the evidence that the everlasting purpose of God's own love is directed towards them. Comp. 2 Thess. ii. 13, where an address almost entirely similar stands also in connection with election; Col. iii. 12; Rom. xi. 28; Ps. lx. 7 [5]; cviii. 7 [6],* where the members of the chosen people are called יְדִידֵי יְהוָֹה LXX. ἀγαπητοί. Thus the members of the Old and of the New Testament Church are spoken of both as God's chosen and as His beloved. Ἐκλογή, selection, the election of grace, is the acting of the Divine love, whereby God has from eternity freely devised in Christ the plan of salvation, according to which all men should be called in succession to the kingdom of heaven,† and has likewise received into the same these ordained persons.‡ Ἐκλέγεσθαι answers to בָּחַר, *e. g.* Deut. vii. 6, and includes three things: ἐκ-λέγ-εσθαι: the stem marks the freeness of the Divine choice; the middle, that God has chosen men for Himself, into the fellowship of His love, for His own; ἐκ, to select, out from the world, comp. John xv. 15; xvi. 19 [John xv. 16, 19]. In our place ἐκλογή denotes, not, as Rom. ix. 11, the act of choosing, but, as 2 Pet. i. 10, the being chosen [Möller §]; Rom. xi. 7, the chosen. Paul constantly gives this title of elect to Christians, in whom through their calling and faith the purpose of redemption is realized; see vv. 5, 6.

10. (V. 5.) **Because.**—Ὅτι not = *that* (Luther, Bengel, Schott, &c.), but = *because, for.* It serves not to analyze τὴν ἐκλογήν, but to confirm εἰδότες τὴν ἐκλ. ὑμῶν. The Apostle assigns two grounds of his knowledge of the election of the Thessalonians, both lying in the nature of the case, so far as from the realization of election an inference may be drawn backward to its existence: 1. the call had come to them in power (v. 5); 2. they had received it in faith (v. 6). The first takes place on the part of God through the apostolical preaching, the second on the part of men; and therefore to τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν (v. 5) the ὑμεῖς (v. 6) is emphatically opposed.

11. **Our gospel came** [German: **showed itself**] **unto you.**—Before Paul came to Macedonia and Thessalonica, as Rieger also and Olshausen remind us, he was forbidden by the Holy Ghost to preach the word in the provinces of Asia and Bithynia (Acts xvi. 6, 7); from which he could but infer that the hour of their election had not yet struck (it came later, ch. xix. 10). Instead of this, he was called by a vision to Macedonia (ch. xvi. 9, 10), and here, and therefore also in Thessalonica, he was able to preach with more than ordinary power and assurance in the Holy Ghost. By this he perceived that God's saving purpose was directed to the Thessalonians. Ἐγενήθη εἰς, or, which is the same in sense, πρὸς ὑμᾶς, not: *was with you* (Luther), as if it were ἐν ὑμῖν,* but: *came to you*, showed itself in its direction and relation to you. By ἐγενήθη the certainty of the fact is expressed in a sonorous word, which is therefore thrice repeated in vv. 5, 6, and precisely at the essential points. This we have attempted to represent in the translation by: *showed itself.*†

12. **Not in word only, but,** &c.—Comp. as specially parallel 1 Cor. iv. 20; only that μόνον is wanting there, because the λόγος τῶν πεφυσιωμένων is in question, here the preaching of the Apostle. Δύναμις is the objective Divine force, which shone forth from the Apostle in preaching, and wrought as a power on men's souls, *spiritualis doctrinæ energia* (Calvin); πληροφορία, the subjective fulness of conviction, assurance, confidence, and joyfulness, with which he was able to speak; Ewald: *gushing fulness.* In the middle stands the common principle of both: the *Holy Ghost*, who animated the Apostle, and was, indeed, the Author alike of the former fact, the real power, and of this consciousness, the fulness of confidence. By means of ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, significantly placed in the centre, as it were the soul of both, δύν. and πληροφ. receive their precise specification; for with mere power and assurance can even a worldly orator speak.—Power and spirit belong together (comp. 1 Cor. ii. 4; Rom. xv. 19; Acts i. 8; x. 38; comp. Luke i. 35), and so spirit and life (Rom. viii. 12 [11]; John vi. 63; 2 Cor. iii. 6; Rom. viii. 2, 10.

13. **Even as ye know what,** &c.—With this begin the appeals, so frequent in the sequel, especially ch. ii. 1-12 (vv. 1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 11), to the personal knowledge of the Thessalonians respecting the Apostle's behavior among them. These can only be explained by the fact, that some sought to misrepresent that behavior, and bring it under suspicion. Οἷοι, how behaved, in what power and fulness of the Spirit (Olshausen); carried out in detail, ch. ii. 1-12. So little does the Apostle divide his gospel, his preaching, his office, from his person, that for proof of the former he appeals, and can appeal, to the latter. He says not: *how we preached*, but: *how we were.* The whole man preached. Such a fine advance of the thought characterizes the style of the Apostle.—By the δι' ὑμᾶς put significantly at the close Paul hints thus early at what he afterwards also further unfolds, ch. ii. 1 sqq., that in his ministry he had sought not his own advantage, but only the salvation of the Thessalonians.

14. (V. 6.) **And ye became,** &c.—After v. 5 should be placed, not, as is commonly done, a period,

* [The German Bible, like the Hebrew, includes the titles of the Psalms among the numbered verses.—J. L.]

† [I do not know where Scripture teaches that this is a part of the plan of salvation, or where ἐκλογή is employed to express any such idea; nor is it easy to see how it could be, except, indeed, as the human race might be spoken of as thus distinguished from the angels that sinned.—J. L.]

‡ [What persons? All men in succession? or the Church members referred to in the previous sentence? In either case *reception* and *election* represent totally different ideas.—The whole definition is lacking in accuracy and precision. Nor do these qualities by any means characterize all that is added on this topic under the Doctrinal head. This is not the place for the discussion of theological systems. But I may be allowed simply to refer to what is said on this point in my *Lectures on Thessalonians*, p. 55 sqq. and p. 542 sq.—J. L.]

§ [Dr. W. Möller. He edited the 3d edition of De Wette's *Exeg. Handbuch* on the Epistles to the Galatians and Thessalonians, 1864.—J. L.]

* [Ellicott would allow this sense to πρὸς ὑμᾶς, and refers to 1 Cor. xvi. 10.—J. L.]

† [See Critical Note 6.—J. L.]

but a comma, v. 6 being still dependent on ὅτι of v. 5, as the emphatic ὑμεῖς is no doubt opposed to τὸ εὐαγγ. ἡμῶν of that verse;* see Exegetical Note 9 [10]. Thus v. 6, with which v. 7 is connected, contains the second ground from which is inferred the election of the Thessalonians, namely, the reception on their part of the call. But, as Paul preached, not merely in a general way, but with power, &c., so they too received the word, not merely in a general way, but in much affliction, with joy of the Holy Ghost. Through these corroborating circumstances on both sides the conclusion in regard to the election becomes the more certain. And therefore is this corroboration emphasized in v. 6 by prefixing μιμηταὶ ἡμῶν ἐγενήθητε, &c.; for the *tertium comparationis* lies not in δεξάμενοι τὸν λογόν, which indeed were unsuitable, in particular, to the Lord, but in this, that in great affliction, with holy joy of the Spirit, they yielded themselves to God in faith, as Paul and the Lord had done in their preaching and official procedure. On μιμηταί, comp. 1 Cor. iv. 16; xi. 1; Phil. iii. 17; Eph. v. 1; Gal. iv. 12, and the Doctrinal division.

15. **Having received the word,** &c.—When through the preaching of the gospel a man experiences in his heart the truth and glory of salvation, this will the more vividly mount even to *joy of the Holy Ghost*, the more that outward *affliction*, that is, hostility and persecution for the gospel's sake, seeks to dispute with him the possession of salvation. As a counterpoise to the world's intimidation and vexation, the Holy Ghost works this inward joy at the opening prospect of an everlasting communion with God (πνεύματος ἁγίου, genitive of the origin, like the genitives of v. 3). And now the question is, whether the man gives the victory to this joy or to that affliction, to the new power of the Spirit or to the old power of the flesh. If he does the first, the case comes to δέχεσθαι τὸν λόγον.† The δέχεσθαι—on which comp. ch. ii. 13; Luke viii. 13; Acts viii. 14; xi. 1; xvii. 11; James i. 21 (δέξασθε τὸν λόγον, imperative)—expresses man's agency in the work of salvation, as this is likewise marked by ὑμεῖς. But this agency is not an independent efficiency (Pelagianism), nor any coöperation (Synergism), but an acceptance, the affirmation of the Divine working on us and in us, a free receptivity.‡ While a man thus gives admission to prevenient grace, asserting itself to him inwardly in the word of the Spirit (v. 5), and acting upon his heart, he yet recognizes the new life as entirely the work of the Holy Spirit, because he himself has not effected, but merely received it.—On the affliction of the Thessalonians, see Acts xvii. 5 sqq. At Thessalonica, and generally in the primitive Church period, conversion was an act of personal courage and vigorous self-denial, since a man had to be prepared to surrender comfort, honor, property, and life itself.

16. (V. 7.) **A pattern to all the believers** answers to the μιμηταί of v. 6: The true followers become themselves in turn patterns for others. This circumstance, moreover, that they had become a pattern for others, might be of use to the Thessalonians for confirmation in their faith, and for their conviction of its reality; the Apostle, therefore, still further enlarges upon it in the following section (vv. 7–10), to which our verse forms the transition.—*Believers* is one of the most frequent designations of Christians in the New Testament—comp. Acts ii. 44; iv. 32—along with ἅγιοι, &c.

17. **Macedonia and Achaia,** whither the Apostle journeyed from Thessalonica. Achaia, originally the most northern territory of the Peloponnesus, was from the year 146 before Christ the name of the Roman province that embraced the Peloponnesus and Hellas, since by the overthrow of the Achæan League the Romans had made themselves masters of Greece. The two provinces of Macedonia and Achaia together formed the entire Greek domain, and are therefore often named together (Acts xviii. 12; xix. 21; Rom. xv. 26; 2 Cor. ix. 2).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. (V. 2.) The exordiums of the Pauline Epistles afford us noteworthy glimpses of the devotional life of the Apostle. So faithfully and constantly did he bear churches and individuals on his heart in intercession and thanksgiving, that he is able to speak of it to his readers in terms, which to the common sense appear hyperbolical. And it is true that the apostolic is by its very nature hyperbolical, inasmuch as the Apostles transcend the ordinary measure, and excel all others not only as preachers and founders of the Church, but also as men of prayer. When the Twelve at Jerusalem gave up the external services to the deacons, they said: "But we will give ourselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the word" (Acts vi. 4). Prayer is to them the full half, and indeed the first half, of their office. And so Paul too begins his Epistles, in which he addresses the word to the churches, with a distinct reference to the fact, that he is constantly praying for them. By prayer we act upon God; by the word, on the world, on men. To every labor for the world must be added the blessing of God; the moral can prosper only on the religious ground. Hence for every man the golden, in its simplicity inconceivably wise and comprehensive, rule: Pray and labor. But for the laborer in the word, whereby the world is to be brought to God, and the Spirit of God is to enter men's souls, the rule has a double value. And indeed from the statements of the Apostle we observe that he had regular *exercises* of devotion; as a result of which, his Epistles manifest a continual devotional *frame*.

2. (V. 3.) On *faith, love, hope*, see Exegetical Note 5.

3. (V. 4.) *Election* is not to be so understood, as if God had appointed some men to salvation, to the exclusion of others. The latter are not rejected, but simply passed by for a time [?—*nur zurückgestellt*]. Election has reference to an organic position in that kingdom of God, to which all men are appointed and, in connection therewith, to a temporal entrance into the same (see Rom. ix.–xi., and on that passage especially J. T. BECK, *Versuch einer pneumatisch hermeneutischen Entwicklung des ix. Kapitels im Brief an die Römer*, Stuttgart, 1833). "God chooses for Himself out of all, before others and for

* [The Author's German version repeats the ὅτι: *and because ye became*, &c. But it is better, with ELLICOTT, to regard the connection of v. 6 with that particle as rather logical than structural, and so "to place neither a period (TISCHENDORF, ALFORD), nor a comma (LACHMANN, BUTTMANN), but a colon, after v. 5." In the Translation, indeed, ELLICOTT, perhaps through oversight, retains the period.—J. L.]

† [The joy of the Holy Ghost is rather the accompaniment and the fruit of faith, than, as here represented, the preparation for it.—J. L.]

‡ [On δέχεσθαι as compared with παραλαβεῖν, see Exegetical Notes on ch. ii. 13.—J. L.]

others." (RICHTER, *Hausbibel*, on Eph. i. 4.) Quite as little is election to be so understood, as if in the elect grace wrought irresistibly, so that they could not fail to become and remain believers. Rather, when God's hour for a man has struck, there goes forth to him through the Gospel the call (v. 5), which he can receive or not (v. 6;—on the relation between grace and freedom, see the second Note on that verse); and, when he has received it, it is still for him a question of permanent interest, that he persevere and continue steadfast in grace (see 2 Thess. ii. 13-15: *εἵλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς—ἐκάλεσεν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου—ἄρα οὖν στήκετε.* 2 Pet. i. 10): "Scripture certainly knows only of a Divine *causality* in the matter of salvation; but neither does it conflict with this, that the *conditions* of obtaining salvation rest with man." * (STIER, on Eph. i. 4.) By means of the first view, that the election of grace is to be understood in an organic and historical sense, the difficulty in regard to the *reprobi* is solved; by means of the other, that freedom, or, more precisely, man's free receptivity is not annulled, but unbound, by grace and the election of grace, is solved the difficulty in regard to the *electi*. "A *prædestinatio sanctorum* is spoken of, but without at the same time affirming also a *reprobatio impiorum* or a *gratia irresistibilis*." (OLSHAUSEN, on Eph. i. 4.) Predestination is a *decretum absolutum*, and to that extent remains ever a mystery, in so far as it rests on the free good pleasure of the Divine love and wisdom, which according to their sovereign decision, yet not otherwise in the kingdom of God than in secular history, assign to one a distinguished, to another an inglorious, position; but it is no *decretum horrendum*, because on the ground of what God gives men move with freedom, and so the claims of conscience and reason remain secure. Nay, only thus does predestination become, what it is to Paul, the Divine world-idea, the plan, formed in Christ, of creation and redemption, which lies at the basis of the entire development of the world, and comprehends the successive elevation or reintroduction of the creatures into the glory of the Creator. But for believers the knowledge of election has a double significance—a humbling one, made especially prominent in Rom. ix.; and one that lifts up, with which the Apostle has to do here, and at Eph. i. 4; Rom. viii. 28-30. The first consideration is the consciousness, fatal to all self-righteousness, that our salvation rests not on any doings or performances of ours, but is founded wholly out of and above ourselves in the free, everlasting mercy of God. The second is the lofty and joyful assurance, wherein believers find comfort, that their salvation is therefore not of yesterday, but from eternity; that it rests not on weak, human props, but in the eternal purpose of grace of the Father in the Son, into the world-pervading realization of which they know themselves to be taken up. The grace of God is all-embracing; but it is precisely *in consequence of* the universality of the gracious disposition that despisers perish. JUL. MÜLLER: "Love could not be in earnest with itself, did it not deny its denial." [Matt. x. 33; Luke xii. 9.] To believers, on the other hand, it never occurs either to suppose that now indeed they can no longer miscarry, or even to claim superiority to other men, as if God had not loved the world. "From all weakness and temptation we may ever again revert to the eternal foundation, that in Jesus Christ God has foreordained us, that within the eternal contemplation of His Son is included our election, which now advances in manifestation and accomplishment, till we hear the gospel and are sealed by the Spirit. Only this is implied in the election of grace, as Paul explains it, that faith has reason to consider itself chosen; of those who do not attain to this grace he speaks not at all." ("Minutes of the Preachers' Conference at Stuttgart, May 12, 1852, p. 309.)—[BARNES: It is possible for a people (and for individuals) to know that they are chosen of God, and to give such evidence of it that others shall know it also.—J. L.]

4. (V. 5.) The call does not come through every sort of gospel-preaching, but through preaching filled with the Spirit, and an essential point in the matter is the personal endowment of the preachers. Comp. the Exegetical Notes 11 and 12.

5. (Vv. 6 and 7.) Christianity proposes to men no new problems which they must first solve by themselves, and as it were in new paths; it is also in this respect not a law, but a gospel. The primary problem is solved, the way is prepared, and in this way there are forerunners, in whose footsteps we simply tread, God, Christ, and His witnesses. God was imitated by Christ (John v. 19 sq.), Christ by Paul and the Apostles (1 Cor. xi. 1), Paul by the Thessalonians and all who so walked (Phil. iii. 17), and then again these *imitators* themselves became a *pattern* for others (see Exegetical Note 15). Nor is that a spiritless imitation, but a following (Luke ix. 23 sqq., 57 sqq.) in the power of the Spirit, who begets ever new, fresh life, though in historical continuity; since He is a Spirit of remembrance (John xiv. 26), yea, the ever-present God Himself, authenticating His earlier creations by those subsequent, so that preceding spiritual men become models and instruments of training for the later, and that word: Learn of me (Matt. xi. 29), finds its fulfilment perpetually renewed. Thus the Church hangs through Christ on God, and from God there goes forth through Christ and His Apostles into the world an unbroken succession of bright forms, a cloud of witnesses (Heb. xii. 1), who are images and representatives of God in the world, and, in connection with their predecessors, leave a personal impress of the heavenly, spiritual quality, according to the circumstances and needs of each several period. As we commence the missionary work amongst a heathen people, not by translating the Bible into their language, but by sending messengers to them—(it is not without reason that *πορευθέντες* occurs in the missionary charge, Matt. xxviii. 19)—so, in general, to the word of the Spirit, even the preached, audible word, must still be added the visible stamp of the Spirit in living personalities, who show by act the power and glory of the gospel, and in whom can be seen, if the expression is allowed, the holy arts of the spiritual walk—the spiritual dietetics. On this rests the high importance of good biographies, and yet more of the living observation of Christian characters. What Christian owes not his best thanks to such life-impressions? For, indeed, humanity is so organized, and this is its noble distinction, that what is deepest rests ever on the relation of person to person: the relation of father and child, of master and disciples, penetrates everywhere. OETINGER: "It cannot be denied that an embodied

* [Only let it be added, that the "Divine causality" extends also to the "human conditions," though in such a way, however to us incomprehensible, as does not at all impair, but rather strengthens, man's free moral agency. See Acts xiii. 48; xvi. 14; Eph. ii. 8; 2 Tim. ii. 25; Luke xxii. 32; 1 Pet. i. 5; Jude 24; &c.—J. L.]

visible gospel* is necessary to the right use of the written rule, and of the hearing of preaching. The written standard must be made available through the help of the Spirit in the members." Hence the importance of Church History in its innermost sanctuary, so far as it is a history of the invisible Church, of men of God, of true saints. That is the most living tradition, the tradition of the Spirit and of power. In this sense also an essential importance belongs to the Church as well as to Holy Scripture. She is in a certain sense a continuation of the actual revelation of God alongside of the verbal revelation, wherein, it is true, the word of God reaches, as it always does, far beyond the fact, and the latter serves only as a step and means of guidance to the former (comp. John ii. 11 and 22; v. 36 sqq. and 39 sqq.; xiv. 10, 11). And thus shall it be, till what we shall be appears; then fact and word become one.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

V. 2. Prayer, as in the apostolic Epistles, so generally, the beginning and foundation of the promulgation of the word. The preacher's office a perseverance in prayer and in the ministry of the word; comp. Acts vi. 4.—The Apostle's daily communication with his churches by prayer.—ZWINGLI: True love is careful for the brethren.—A Christian preacher gives God glory and thanks for what through him has been wrought in souls; and just so the praise of other men becomes in the Christian's mouth thanksgiving to God.—RIEGER: Oh, the lightening of the official burden, when the Lord still opens our eyes, and shows us for what we have to give thanks, and for what to pray!—THEODORET: We should first give thanks for the good already bestowed upon us, and only then pray for what still is wanting. So do we find it everywhere with the Apostle.—DIEDRICH: Happy the man, who is able to let all his joy pour itself forth in pure thanksgiving to the Father. Otherwise there is even no joy werth anything.—CALVIN: An important motive to zealous progress is the reflection, that God has granted to us noble gifts for the perfecting of the work begun; that under His guidance we have already made advances on the right road for reaching the end. For as an idle confidence in the virtues to which men foolishly lay claim puffs them up, and makes them secure and sluggish, so the recognition of God's gifts humbles pious souls, and incites them to a solicitous zeal.

V. 3. CALVIN: A brief description of true Christianity: 1. That faith be earnest and vigorous; 2. that no pains be spared, so long as there are neighbors to be assisted, but that all the pious assiduously fulfil the obligations of love; 3. they should studiously endeavor, in the hope of Christ's manifestation, to despise all things else, and by patience overcome both the irksomeness of the long interval (to the appearing of the Lord), and all the temptations of the world.—LUTHER: Faith is a lively, active, practical, temperate thing, so that it cannot but do good works unremittingly. It does not even ask whether good works are to be done; but let a man rather ask whether he has done, and is ever doing, them. Without constraint, therefore, a man becomes willing and glad to do good to every one, to serve every one, to suffer in every way, from love to God and for His glory, who has shown him so great grace; so that it is impossible to separate works from faith, as impossible as for heat and light to be separated from fire.—BENGEL: He, who from regard to his own profit and ease withdraws from labor, loves little.—RIEGER: Love will have reality and truth, nor that in such measure only as is convenient for every man, bringing him honor and a good name, without too closely compromising his own life; but so that a man must descend withal from his own station, and the distinctions thereto belonging, and, instead of finding his pleasure in himself, place himself in the circumstances of another: that is what is meant by the labor of love. Under the patience of hope may be comprehended the entire career of our Lord Jesus Christ. For it is all summed up in this, that He condescended to what was most ignominious, and maintained Himself above what was most glorious; as now in our career of faith everything depends on the hope of the kingdom breaking its way through tribulation with the patience of Christ.

V. 4. Election the highest comfort of the tempted.—ZWINGLI: Paul therewith guards his commendation, lest they arrogate to themselves what belongs to God alone.—Marks of election: 1. a powerful call; 2. a believing reception of the gospel as the word of God; comp. ch. ii. 13.—An anointed preacher may thus comfort tempted believers, and one Christian another: I know that thou art chosen.—RIEGER: The Apostle speaks thus decidedly of their election, in consequence of the call and the evidence of their obedience to it. Nor is it even beyond our present measure to form such a judgment, in praise of the work of God in a soul, though formerly, to be sure, it may have been more perceptible. Our office otherwise loses its proper force [*Seele*, soul], when we never dare to discern between the righteous and the unrighteous, or to recognize as dead or alive what really is so.

Vv. 3, 4. [SCOTT: Faith which worketh not obedience; professed love that declines self-denying labor; and hope which is separated from patient continuance in well-doing, can never prove a man's election.—J. L.]

V. 5. The right preaching of the kingdom of God, like itself, stands not in words, but in power.—Spiritual power dwells in the preaching, when the hearers feel that the preacher himself is a man of firm conviction, who stands in the joyful assurance of that which he preaches.—Power on others and assurance (within) we cannot give to ourselves; it is a gift of the Holy Ghost. Even an Apostle cannot everywhere work with equal force. It behoves us, renouncing self, to yield ourselves to the Lord.—The preacher's doctrine and life must form one whole.—JOHN MICH. HAHN: A holy, Christian behavior makes impressions on elect souls. Wherever we go or sojourn, let us never forget that we too are closely watched and observed. Our aim must be to walk as elect, holy and beloved, not only before our Holy Father, but also before the dear ones whom our Lord has purchased for Himself.

V. 6. The right disposition of preachers and hearers.—DIEDRICH: Ye are in the heavenward march of the children of God, that is led by the God-Man.—RIEGER: To hear and receive God's word has been specified by the Saviour Himself as the decisive badge of those, who are of God and of the truth; especially when one is not deterred by the outside covering of shame and affliction.—ROOS: A gospel or good news should cause joy, and, if unable to cause any, it is no gospel. When amongst

* [German: *ein visibles und sichtbares Evangelium*.]

Jews, Heathens, or Christians, unbelief, idolatry, and all damnable ungodliness is reproved, this rebuke should be keen and of swift operation; but so likewise should joy over the simultaneously proffered grace swiftly rise, and cause the pain occasioned by the rebuke to be disregarded, when compared with the richness of the proffered grace, or with the happy condition into which a man now enters.—[JOWETT: The suffering that comes from without cannot depress the spirit of a man who is faithful in a good cause. It is only when "from within are fears" that the mind is enslaved.—J. L.]

V. 7. RIEGER: Who becomes a follower of the Lord, without confiding also in brave predecessors and comrades, and becoming their follower? It amounts to a great perverseness, when any would break down confidence in those who by word and work, doctrine and life, are helpers of the truth, and would pretend in this to a zeal for the Lord, supposing that they are striving merely against a ruinous dependence on men. Whoever in his following casts off humility, fails likewise to attain the grace to become a pattern.—Even believers need patterns of the genuineness and evidence of joy under affliction.—[WEBSTER and WILKINSON: It requires higher grace, and is a more important duty, to be an example to believers than to the world, ch. ii. 10.—J. L.]

CH. I. 8–10.

2. Other Christians also, who have heard thereof, bear witness to the blessed work of the Apostle at Thessalonica, and the thorough conversion of the Thessalonians.

8 For [Sin. omits γάρ] from you sounded out [hath been sounded forth, ἐξήχηται] the
word of the Lord[1] not only in Macedonia and Achaia,[2] but also in every [but in
every][3] place your faith to God-ward [toward God] is spread abroad [hath gone forth,
9 ἐξελήλυθεν], so that we need not [have no need][4] to speak anything. For they them-
selves shew of us [report concerning us, περὶ ἡμῶν ἀπαγγέλλουσιν] what manner of enter-
ing in [entrance, εἴσοδον] we had[5] unto you, and how ye turned to God from [the][6] idols,
10 to serve the living and true God, and to wait for His Son from heaven [the heavens],[7]
whom He raised from the[8] dead, even Jesus, which delivered us [who delivered us][9] from
the wrath to come [the coming wrath, τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης].

[1] V. 8.—[The German adopts a different arrangement of this verse. See Exeg. Note 2. For κυρίου, Sin.[1] has θεοῦ.—J. L.]

[2] V. 8.—[There is large authority of manuscripts (including Sin.) and versions for the repetition of ἐν τῇ before Ἀχαΐᾳ (Scholz, Schott, Lachmann). But this is supposed to be an assimilation to v. 7. Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott, &c., retain the common reading (A. B., many cursive mss., and some versions and Fathers).—J. L.]

[3] V. 8.—Καί after ἀλλά should be cancelled, with Lachmann, Tischendorf and others [Alford, Wordsworth, Ellicott], on superior manuscript authority [including Sin.]—to the advantage of the sense.

[4] V. 8.—[μὴ χρείαν ἡμᾶς ἔχειν (rather: ἔχειν ἡμᾶς, with A. B. C. D. Sin., &c.; Lachmann, Scholz, Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth, Ellicott) Our English Version renders χρείαν ἔχειν, *to have need* or *lack*, 24 times; and in 6 of these the negative phrase is, *to have no need*.—J. L.]

[5] V. 9.—Instead of the *Recepta* ἔχομεν, all now read ἔσχομεν, according to the best manuscripts [Sin., &c.], and the sense also favors this.

[6] V. 9.—[τῶν εἰδώλων — הָאֱלִילִים, Is. ii. 18. Comp. 1 John v. 21.—J. L.]

[7] V. 10.—[τῶν οὐρανῶν. Comp. Acts ii. 34; &c.—J. L.]

[8] V. 10.—[The reading, τῶν νεκρῶν, which nearly all the critical editions now follow, "is supported," says Ellicott, "by preponderating external evidence . . . and by the probability of a conformation to the more usual ἐγείρειν ἐκ νεκρῶν." Sin. has the article.—J. L.]

[9] V. 10.—[Or, *our Deliverer*, τὸν ῥυόμενον ἡμᾶς. See Exeg. Note 13. Our Translators here followed the Vulgate, *qui eripuit*, against the older English versions.—For ἀπό, Sin. and one cursive manuscript have ἐκ.—J. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. In commencing a new short section with v. 8, we vary from the common view which takes the whole of the first chapter together. But there are evidently three different testimonies adduced by Paul in support of the two facts, which he is now engaged in proving—his own pure, powerful preaching, and the genuine faith of the Thessalonians. He first gives his own testimony, ch. i. 2–7, especially v. 5 sqq.; then he brings forward that of Christians elsewhere, ch. i. 8 to 10; lastly, he appeals to the Thessalonians and their remembrance of his entrance among them (ch. ii. 1–2), just as on his side he bears witness to them of their believing reception of the word, of which they had, and still have, experience as the word of God (ch. ii. 13 to 16).

2. (V. 8.) There is a question, first of all, of the punctuation of v. 8. Ordinarily a comma is put first after Ἀχαΐᾳ, and then there arises a double inconvenience. In the first place, the proof (γάρ) stretches unsuitably beyond the thing to be proved (v. 7): Ye are become a pattern to the believers in Macedonia and Achaia, for not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but everywhere, have you been heard of. In the second place, the clause with *but* is, in a manner at once unsuitable and really insignificant, provided with a new subject and verb, whilst we are expecting only: From you the word of the Lord has come forth not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but in all places. If Paul meant to introduce a new subject and verb into the latter clause, he must have placed after οὐ μόνον the subject and verb of the former clause, together with ἀφ' ὑμῶν, which answers to the ὑμεῖς

after πίστις.* It will therefore be better, with CALVIN, LÜNEMANN and others, to put a colon after κυρίου, so that now οὐ μόνον ἐν, as well as ἀλλ' ἐν, is dependent on ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἐξελήλυθεν.† If in this way the second of the difficulties named is obviated, so not less is the first also, since now the logical relation, expressed by γάρ, of v. 8 to v. 7 is formed thus: Ye are become a pattern to the believers in Macedonia and Achaia; for even in other quarters it has become known, how the word of God has wrought among you. On this new thought the Apostle now dwells, and carries it out by itself still further and beyond v. 7. For the exemplariness of the Thessalonians is not the main thought to be established in the following verses, but forms merely the transition to the new witnesses, the citation of whom is (according to Note 1) properly his object. That the clause with οὐ μόνον appears attached to the preceding one by asyndeton need not disturb us, since, with explanatory clauses particularly, this is frequently the case, comp. ch. ii. 7, 9. Winer, p. 476.

3. **From you hath been sounded forth.**—Ἀφ' ὑμῶν stands emphatically first; ἀπό in the proper local sense: *out from you.* Ἐξήχηται in the New Testament ἅπαξ λεγόμενον; ἐξηχέω commonly intransitive, but also in classic Greek transitive = to cause to sound forth; ἐξηχεῖται, *it sounds forth, is heard abroad.* Similarly here with the sense of the perfect: The word of God has been so powerful among you, has produced a movement so lively and loud, that the sound thereof, so to speak, [as of a trumpet; CHRYSOSTOM,] has propagated itself to a distance—that people have heard it everywhere. BENGEL: *claro sono diditus est.* The idea of resonance (echo) does not lie in the word. Comp. the parallel ἐξελήλυθεν: *has pressed forth, become known* (Luke vii. 17).

4. **The word of the Lord—your faith in God.**—These two expressions of themselves describe Christianity on its two sides; the word on the Divine side, but offering itself to men; faith on the human, but turning to meet the approach of God; vv. 5 and 6. In the present connection, however, where the second clause merely carries out further the first, and where also, therefore, the verbs are synonymous, both points are jointly intended under both expressions:* the word of God, as it was preached by the Apostle and believingly received by the Thessalonians (so also OLSHAUSEN, DE WETTE, KOCH), and hence the emphatic position of ἀφ' ὑμῶν; faith, as it was aroused in the Thessalonians by the Apostle's preaching (LÜNEMANN). But still the word of the Lord stands first, precluding mere human glory—The *word of the Lord* (as in Thess. iii. 1), the word or the gospel of Christ (Col. iii. 16; Rom. i. 9, and often), not different from the word or gospel of God (1 Cor. xiv 36; Rom. i. 1, and often), just as in the Acts ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ and ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου are used interchangeably. It is not a genitive of the object = *verbum de Deo*, but, as is clear especially from ch. ii. 13, a genitive of the subject or author = the word which Christ or God causes to be proclaimed (LÜNEMANN, &c.). *Faith in God*, because most of the Christians in Thessalonica had previously been heathens, see v. 9; πίστις πρός, instead of the common εἰς,† also at Philem. 5; comp. 2 Cor. iii. 4.

5. **In every place**, where, that is, there are Christian churches, even beyond Macedonia and Achaia; similarly full expressions, Rom. i. 8; Col. i. 6, 23. But since Paul had not in the meantime left these countries, ὥστε μή &c. must have reference to letters or visits. EWALD and others call attention to the fact that precisely in Corinth where Paul wrote our Epistle, with trade converging there from all quarters of the Roman world, was it possible for him to give such an assurance. The church need not, therefore, have already existed for a long period (against BAUR), but its rapid, powerfully spreading conversion must have excited great attention. The words also indicate an intercourse of the liveliest kind among the Christians.

6. (V. 9.) **They themselves.**—*Ad sensum*, the explanation is from the previous ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ (v. 8). —**Concerning us.**—Ἡμῶν refers, as the double specification (ὁποίαν καὶ πῶς) shows, to the Apostle and his helpers on the one side, and the Thessalonians on the other.‡

7. **What manner of entrance we had unto you.**—εἴσοδον does not answer to the German *Eingang* in the sense of friendly reception, entrance into the heart (PELT, OLSHAUSEN and many). Opposed to this is partly the word itself (see ch. ii. 1 sq. and comp. Acts xiii. 24), and partly the connection, since it is in the following clause, καὶ πῶς, that mention is first made of the reception of the Apostle and his preaching. The word means a *going in, introduction* (CHRYSOSTOM, CALVIN, DE WETTE, &c.): "what sort of an introduction we had to you, to wit, with the preaching of the gospel; *i. e.* (comp. v. 5), with what power and fulness of the Holy Ghost (CALVIN), with what inward confidence and contempt of outward dangers (CHRYSOSTOM, &c.), we proclaimed to you

* [Accordingly, not a few interpreters from PAGNINUS to SCHOTT and GERLACH assume such a transposition.—J. L.]

† [Others, on the contrary, as MARTIN's French version and MICHAELIS, introduce the colon immediately after τόπῳ, and throw all that precedes on the first verb. "The most simple explanation," says ELLICOTT, "appears that of RÜCKERT (*Loc. Paul. Expl.* Jena, 1844), according to which the Apostle is led by the desire of making a forcible climax into a disregard of the preceding nominative, and in fact puts a sentence in antithesis to οὐ μόνον—Ἀχαΐᾳ instead of a simple local clause, ἐν πάντι τόπῳ, or ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ (Rom. i. 8), as the strict logical connection actually required." But if we acquiesce in this view of the case as one of interrupted or mixed construction, it is not necessary, as I remarked in the *Revision* of the verse, Note g, with Rückert, to lay the main stress on ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν, or, except in the particular of local extent, to find any increase of force whatever in the latter clause. On the contrary, ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἐξήχηται ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου sounds something greater than ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἐξελήλυθεν; and the very feeling of the writer that the former phrase implied, on the part of the Thessalonians, more of evangelical influence, if not missionary activity, than could properly be asserted of them in reference to the regions beyond their own Greek provinces, may have prompted the use, in the latter connection, of the weaker form of expression: From you hath been sounded forth the word of the Lord, and not only is that true, as I have just intimated (v. 7), in relation to Macedonia and Achaia, but everywhere, throughout all the household of faith, the fact and the circumstances of your conversion are familiarly known." ALFORD retains the ordinary punctuation, but regards the "new subject and predicate as merely an epexegesis of the former."—J. L.]

* [This view of the synonymous equivalence of the two clauses is given by BAUMGARTEN, and is adopted, besides those mentioned above, by ALFORD. But see Note † on p. 70.—J. L.]

† [ELLICOTT: "The less usual preposition πρός is here used with great propriety, as there is a tacit contrast to a previous faith, πρὸς τὰ εἴδωλα (see ver. 9), in which latter case the deeper πίστ. εἰς. . . . would seem theologically unsuitable."—J. L.]

‡ [So LÜNEMANN. But the common restriction of ἡμῶν to the preachers is greatly to be preferred; see ALFORD. Of the other view ELLICOTT remarks: "The studied prominence of περὶ ἡμῶν and the real point of the clause are thus completely overlooked: Instead of our telling about our own success, they do it for us; ἃ γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἐχρῆν παρ' ἡμῶν ἀκούειν, ταῦτα αὐτοὶ προλαβόντες λέγουσι, Chrys."—J. L.]

the gospel." Mark the expressive emphasis in ὁποίαν; it is not merely ἥν or οἷοι (comp. οἷοι, v. 5) or ποίαν. Πῶς likewise is not = *that* [Alford: *how that*, referring merely to the fact; and so Ellicott], but = under what difficult circumstances, and with what joy of the Spirit withal; it points back to v. 6, just as ὁποίαν to v. 5. At the same time we here detect the joy of the foreign brethren over the faith of the Thessalonians.

8. **How ye turned to God from the idols.**—Ἐπιστρέφειν is the regular New Testament word for conversion; in the Acts, where it is naturally of frequent occurrence, with the addition ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον (ch. xi. 21), or εἰς φῶς (ch. xxvi. 18), or ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν (ch. xxvi. 18, 20; xiv. 15; xv. 9), often too with an ἀπό, whose substantive describes heathenism sometimes on the side of its demonian background, sometimes on the side of men, sometimes of the idols, viz. ch. xxvi. 18 ἀπὸ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σατανᾶ, ch. xv. 19 ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν, ch. xiv. 15 ἀπὸ τῶν ματαίων ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ θεὸν ζῶντα. With this class is connected the expression in our verse. The latter, negative element corresponds to repentance (Acts xxvi. 20); the former, positive one to faith (Acts xi. 21).

9. **To serve the living and true God.**—Δουλεύειν * and ἀναμένειν are infinitives of the purpose. The primary feeling of profound awe in presence of Deity, that belongs to human nature and especially to antiquity, finds expression also in language. The Old Testament employs, over against God, the expression that denotes the relation of the most unconditional subjection, that of the slave to his master: עָבַד (Ex. ix. 1, 13; Deut. viii. 19; and often); to which expression the corresponding inner sentiment is fear (יָרֵא, Jon. i. 9; comp. פַּחַד, of God, Gen. xxxi. 42, 53). To fear God and to serve God, these are the two most common Biblical expressions for religion. And so in our text also appears δουλεύειν θεῷ as the designation of religion or of religious practice generally; or rather, what we are accustomed to designate by these faint expressions, is in a more concrete and living way conveyed by the Apostle in that phrase, as we too have the beautiful word *Gottesdienst* [Divine service]. By means of the additions to τῷ θεῷ the phraseology becomes a closer description of the true religion, in opposition to the false: ζῶντι, living, in opposition to the dead idol-images (see Rom. i. 23); ἀληθινῷ, existing in objective truth and reality, in opposition to the merely imaginary, lying idols (see Rom. i. 25). It may be thought strange that the Apostle uses, in regard to Christianity, such a general expression, that is applied also to the Old Testament religion as contrasted with heathenism, whereas he then puts what is specifically Christian, not into faith in Jesus, the Son of God and the Saviour, but into the expectation of His return from heaven. But it is just in its connection with v. 10 that the general expression of our verse acquires also a more especially Christian sense. A man can, in truth, only then really serve God, when he has access to him through Christ, and is by His blood purified from the dead works of the old, ungodly mind (see Heb. ix. 14). And that Paul had not been silent on this point at Thessalonica, that he had proclaimed Christ as the Son of God, as the Saviour, and salvation in His death and resurrection, all that we see from v. 10. But certainly our two verses show that his preaching at Thessalonica had turned, not so much round this central doctrine of salvation, as about the beginning and the end, the first things and the last. A parallel is furnished by the speech which the Apostle soon afterwards delivered at Athens (Acts xvii. 22–31). There too he first of all leads his hearers over from the idols to the living God, and speaks of Christ especially as the future Judge, and only incidentally, in connection with that, of His resurrection, and of faith therein; though this, it is true, significantly enough forms the conclusion. —[Webster and Wilkinson: "He puts together the first and last articles of their creed; and then supplies the two most important of the intervening articles." —J. L.]

10. (V. 10.) **And to wait for.**—The Apostle defines the life-aim of the converts in two particulars, the service of God, and the waiting for the return of His Son from heaven. Though we should even say with Olshausen, that ἐπιστρέφειν includes faith, and δουλεύειν implies love, it is only the more surprising that hope is raised into such explicit and emphatic prominence. This agrees and is connected with the whole eschatological tenor of our Epistles, as well as of the Apostle's oral teaching at Thessalonica, and it contains a weighty warning for the Church (see Doctrinal and Ethical, no. 3). Bengel says in his New Testament on our text: To wait for the Son of God is the most appropriate mark of a true Christian. Ἀναμένειν only here in the New Testament; elsewhere we find used of the eschatological waiting προσδέχεσθαι, Luke xii. 36; Tit. ii. 13; ἀπεκδέχεσθαι, Phil. iii. 20; Heb. ix. 26 [28]; 1 Cor. i. 7; Rom. viii. 19, 23, 25; Gal. v. 5; προσδοκᾶν, 2 Pet. iii. 12–14.

11. **From the heavens** &c. coming, belongs to ἀναμένειν. The plural οἱ οὐρανοί, which occurs so often in the New Testament, but in Luther's version is unhappily obliterated (so even in the address of the Lord's Prayer), is to give us an impression of the manifold, rich life of the super-terrestrial world (John xiv. 2). These heavens, which frequently seem to us so remote, strange, and shut, will open their doors, and from them the Son of God will come forth with the heavenly host, to the dismay of the world and the joy of His own. Comp. Acts i. 11.

12. **His Son, whom He raised from the dead.**—The expression, Son of God, is thus used of Christ by Paul in his very first Epistle, though as yet without further specification. But it must be considered, in the first place, that the expression is plainly chosen for the purpose of designating Christ in his inner relation to God mentioned immediately before, and, secondly, that already in connection with it even here is the characteristic *from heaven*, which holds good as well of His first appearing (Gal. iv. 4, ἐξαπέστειλεν, sent forth; Rom. viii. 3; 1 Cor. xv. 47): The Son of God is of heavenly, Divine origin. To the heathen at Thessalonica Paul had proclaimed not merely the true God, but also, what was still more unknown to them, that this God has a Son, who has become our Deliverer (ῥυόμενος). *The resurrection of Jesus from the dead* is the great fact by which He is shown to be the Son of God (Rom. i. 4), and by which at the same time His return is rendered possible and certain (1 Pet. [i.] 3–5). Was ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν to form an antithesis to ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν? Comp. Rom. x. 6, 7.

13. **Jesus, our Deliverer.**—The majestic title, Son of God, is on purpose followed simply and plainly by His human proper name, Jesus. [Webster and Wilkinson: presenting our Lord to us as He was re-

* [The very word applied by Rome to her worship of the saints, while she reserves λατρεύειν for God.—J. L.]

vealed and known in the flesh.—J. L.] τὸν ῥυόμενον: not ῥυσάμ., with reference to the past deliverance by His death;* nor ῥυσόμ., with reference to the future deliverance at the judgment † (both, the latter as founded on the former, at Rom. v. 9, 10), but comprehensively ῥυόμ., our Deliverer, absolutely and evermore; the participle having thus a substantival sense (Winer, p. 316); comp. Rom. xi. v. 26, after Is. lix. 20 גּוֹאֵל. Ῥύεσθαι (comp. Col. i. 13; Rom. vii. 24; Matt. vi. 13), stronger than σώζειν, expresses the deliverance as a mighty fact, a strong, powerful extrication from the judgment, which shall inevitably smite all who have no part in Jesus. Τὸν ῥυόμενον has an explanatory relation to Ἰησοῦν (comp. Matt. i. 21; Acts iv. 10–12), similar to that of ὃν ἤγειρεν &c. to τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ. [Bengel: Christus nos semel ἐλυτρώσατο, *redemit: semper* ῥύεται, *eripit.*—J. L.]

14. **From the coming wrath.**—Wrath is the holy will of God, energetically upholding, over against the sinful creature, His own inviolable order of life and government as the highest interest of the world, and for that reason surrendering for righteous punishment the party resisting it to self-chosen destruction. The word is used sometimes of the affection in God, His punitive justice (Rom. ix. 22; Heb. iii. 11; iv. 3; Rev. vi. 16; and often in the Old Testament); sometimes of the effect in the world, thence resulting, the judicial punishment (Luke xxi. 23; Rom. ii. 5; iii. 5; comp. xiii. 4, 9 [5]; Eph. v. 6; Col. iii. 6); sometimes in such a way that both ideas are included (John iii. 36; Rom. i. 18; ii. 8; Eph. ii. 3; Rev. xiv. 10; xvi. 19; xix. 15). Here and in ch. ii. 16; v. 9 ὀργή stands in the second signification. This is shown also by the addition ἡ ἐρχομένη (comp. Col. iii. 6): the approaching, infallibly imminent punishment; similarly ἡ μέλλουσα ὀργή, Matt. iii. 7; and then Rev. xi. 18, ἦλθεν ἡ ὀργή σου. Salvation or the deliverance is just the being rescued from the judgment that overwhelms the world, Rom. i. 16–18 and, referring back to this, ch. v. 9–11; and this is the immediate sense of σώζειν, σωτήρ, σωτηρία, as here of ῥύεσθαι. In 1 Thess. v. 9 also ὀργή and σωτηρία stand as mutual opposites. Because in Christ judgment has already passed upon the world (John xii. 31), therefore whosoever believeth in Him is no longer judged (John iii. 14–18; v. 24).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. (V. 8.) The man who walks uprightly before God, God accredits also before his brethren, imparting to them through all that is seen of him joy, refreshment, strength, so that they in return are able by their testimony to his conversion and spiritual walk to strengthen and encourage him, when tempted thereupon from without or within. This is the Christian import of the ideas glory, honor, praise, &c. The lofty consciousness, as it is here aroused by the Apostle, does not flatter self-love, but begets an earnest sense of obligation. To be a city on the hill, to which the eyes of all look, is no light responsibility, and brings a man under the discipline of the Spirit. The increase of idle talk is repressed by much affliction.

2. (Vv. 9, 10.) Christian truth is so rich and many-sided (πολυποίκιλος, Eph. iii. 10), that it may be delivered in very various ways and from different points of view. Not only do we find in the New Testament a peculiar style of teaching in the case of every apostolic writer, but even the same Paul, it is evident, addressed the Thessalonians orally and in writing otherwise—put other truths in the foreground—than, for example, in the Epistles to the Galatians and the Romans; and yet at Thessalonica also there was laid the foundation of a steadfast Christianity, approved in trial. This consideration likewise cannot but inspire us in the Church with a large-heartedness and liberality of view in regard to the different ways of conceiving and representing the truth, provided only they stand sincerely and earnestly on the one foundation, 1 Cor. iii. 11, whether they be rather mystical or intellectual, churchly or specially biblical, practical or scientific (in the sense of Eph. i. 17 sq.), clinging to antiquity or looking towards the future. Church Confessions tolerate and require by the side of them all forms of expression. In our hymn-books too we find Paul Gerhardt, Tersteegen, Zinzendorf, Gellert [Toplady, Cowper, the Wesleys], and others, in peace together, uttering one language in various dialects.

3. (V. 10.) The earliest Epistles of Paul are distinguished by their *eschatological* complexion. Subsequently he went back from eschatology to the doctrine of faith and justification (Galatians and Romans), of Christ and the Church (Philippians, Ephesians and Colossians).* In his development of doctrine he pursued a regressive course similar to that of Messianic prophecy before him, and of the Church after him: first, the glorious end, and after that, the way to the end. But neither Old Testament prophecy nor apostolic teaching ever on the way lost sight of the end, the glorious consummation in the kingdom of God. And even in one of his latest Epistles (Tit. ii. 11 sq.) Paul has a passage very kindred to ours: conversion here has its counterpart there in the (objective) appearing of Divine grace, whose aim is declared to be a godly life with denial of the heathen worldly-mindedness (=to serve the living and true God), while expecting the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ (=to wait for His Son from heaven). The Church, however, has, especially since the days of Constantine, too much neglected to wait for the coming of Christ; even the Reformation restored, indeed, the genuine Pauline faith, but not yet the full hope. Calvin finds it here worthy of note, that for the hope of eternal salvation Paul puts the expectation of Christ. For, he adds, without Christ we are lost and hopeless; but, where Christ comes forward, there shines life and prosperity. Very beautiful; still one perceives that he had not yet attained to the full apostolic consciousness of the importance of Christ's coming as distinct from the blessedness after death,† when, it is true, we are

* [See Critical Note 9.—J. L.]

† [Grotius, Benson, Koppe, Pelt, and others.—J. L.]

* [According as the development of error, and the circumstances of particular churches, required.—J. L.]

† [For sufficiently obvious reasons, the general tone of the Reformation period on the subject of Christ's second advent is not quite that of the apostolic age. Much more emphatically, however, is this true of the times that followed the Reformation. In the writings of the more eminent Reformers themselves, Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin, Knox, &c., not a few strong and fervid utterances are found, to which the remark of our Author would not do justice. For example, immediately preceding the above quotation from Calvin we find these words: "Ergo quisquis in vitæ sanctæ cursu perseverare volet, totam mentem applicet ad spem adventus Christi"—where there is no reference whatever to death or the intermediate state. And similar testimonies could easily be multiplied (see the Homiletical Notes on v. 10, and my Missionary Address, on *The Hope*

even already present with the Lord. If the Reformation is a working back to what was originally exhibited for the Church in Holy Scripture, we have then here one of the points in which the Reformation of the 16th century needs to be carried yet further. As we would walk in the footsteps of Prophets and Apostles, and in particular even of our Paul, we must recognize it as our task to quicken anew the element of hope in knowledge and practice. The beginnings, moreover, of such a work show themselves latterly in almost all evangelical countries.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

V. 8. The clear pealing sound, that rings out from the living Church. J. M. HAHN: The awakening of some souls may produce much reflection far and wide.—J. G. KOLB: A good man may through his earnestness become the light and salt of a whole neighborhood. (*Kurzer Lebensabriss von* J. G. KOLB, *nebst einer Sammlung von Betrachtungen*, Stuttgart, 1859).—The report of faith a sweet savor of Christ (comp. 2 Cor. ii. 15 sq.). CHRYSOSTOM: As a sweet-scented ointment keeps not its fragrance shut up within itself, but sends it afar, so likewise noble men keep not their virtue shut up within themselves, but through their reputation are of service to many for their improvement. CHRYSOSTOM then further makes mention of the renown acquired by Macedonia, of which Thessalonica was a principal city, through Alexander the Great, who was not without reason beheld by the prophet [Dan. vii. 6] as a winged leopard, the swiftness and force being thus described, wherewith he scoured the whole world; and so what happened in Macedonia became not less universally known than what occurred in Rome (the seat of the fourth-world empire of Daniel; see Rom. i. 8).—THE SAME: In such circumstances there frequently arises envy (there is indeed, alas, such a thing as spiritual envy; see Gal. v. 26, *φθονοῦντες*; Phil. ii. 3, 4; 1 Cor. xii. 15 sqq.); but even this also your excellence has overcome, and they themselves are heralds of your conflicts.—ZINZENDORF: When Jesus glorifies His time of grace now here now there, rejoice thou in the mercy to others returning.—The testimony of others to our faith a comfort in trial.—[BENSON: It was an honor to any church or city, to have the gospel go out from thence to other places."—J. L.]

V. 9. When the Lord enters the heart through the powerful preaching of the word, that is even the entrance of a king, though in humble raiment.—ZWINGLI: Paul did not ride into Thessalonica with such pride and pomp, as Cardinals, Bishops, and Popish Legates are wont to display.—RIEGER: The idols of the altar were not to be overthrown by the purer knowledge of God, which many philosophers at that time had; the word of the Cross must come, which brought the idols to an end in the heart's affection, and forthwith also in the members; then too they fell as to the service that was paid to them at the altar.—CALVIN: The end of true conversion is the living God. Many renounce superstition only to fall into what is worse; for, losing all sense of God, they plunge into a worldly-minded, irrational * contempt of the Holy One.—The same: We must first be converted, before we can serve God.—THE SAME: —No one is duly converted to God, but the man who has learned to yield himself fully to Him as a servant (*in servitutem*).—RIEGER: Conversion from idolatry to God was certainly in former times a great change; but neither is it at the present time any trifle, when on obedience to the truth the idols of wealth, pleasure, fleshly ease, honor from men, seeking to save one's life in this world, self-love, confidence in the flesh, and such like, are cast forth from the heart's affection.—THE SAME: The living and true God can be served only in spirit and in truth; and that requires a conscience purified in the blood of Jesus from dead works. Without fellowship with the Light, a man deals even with the living God as with a dumb idol (John iv. 23, 24; Heb. ix. 14; see John i. 5-10).

V. 10.—[On the first clause of this verse, see a good note by BARNES.—J. L.]—The Christian is a man who serves God and waits for Jesus.—CALVIN: In the service of God, which in the corruption of our nature is a more than difficult matter, we are kept and established by the expectation of Christ; otherwise the world drags us back to itself, and we grow weary. Waiting for the Lord a main point 1. in the doctrine of Jesus and His Apostles, 2. in the life of faith of the Apostles and first Christians.—RIEGER: As to what is behind, free from everything; for what is before, watchful (Mark xiii. 33 sqq.; Luke xxi. 36).—[ALFORD: The especial aspect of the faith of the Thessalonians was *hope*: hope of the return of the Son of God from heaven: a hope, indeed, common to them with all Christians in all ages, but evidently entertained by them as pointing to an event more immediate than the church has subsequently believed it to be. Certainly these words would give them an idea of the *nearness* of the coming of Christ: and perhaps the misunderstanding of them may have contributed to the notion which the Apostle corrects, 2 Thess. ii. 1 sqq.—J. L.]—We must be in earnest with the expectation of Christ's coming, if we would stand in the fulness of apostolic Christianity. This carries with it, 1. a Warning, a. against every kind of worldly happiness, and service of perishable things and men, especially against the modern absorption in practical and theoretic materialism, even of a refined sort; b. against the Romanizing over-valuing of what we already have even in the Church, and against striving for the Church's outward dominion and glory; c. against false ideals of a great future of the life of nations, to be introduced by our own, be it even Christian, power and activity; and against the so frequent intermixture, concurrent therewith, of the world and the kingdom of God; 2. Comfort, a. in regard to imperfections and sins in ourselves, in the world, in the Church: it has not yet appeared, what we shall be (1 John iii. 2); b. in regard to the sufferings and afflictions, which are the divinely appointed way to the future glory, 2 Cor. iv. 17 sq.; Rom. viii. 17.—CHRYSOSTOM: The sword in hand, the good in expectancy.—[VAUGHAN: A summary of the Christian life in all times; *service*, and *expectation*. The loss or disparagement of either

of the Church, before the Synod of New York, 1865). But take only this pregnant one from Bishop LATIMER's Third Sermon on the Lord's Prayer: "*All* those excellent learned men whom, without doubt, God hath sent into this world in these latter days to give the world warning—all those men do gather out of Sacred Scripture that the last day cannot be far off. And this is most certain and sure that, whensoever He cometh, He cometh not too timely; for all things which ought to come before are passed now: so that, if He come this night or to-morrow, He cometh not too early." The modern device, of interposing between us and that blessed hope the promised times of universal blessing, had not yet been thought of.—J. L.]

* [*Weltlichgesinnte, unvernünftige;* CALVIN: *profanum et brutum, profane and brutish*.—J. L.]

has been in all times the cause of injury to the Church. The one, by itself, degenerates into a dry routine of duty: the other, into excitement, dreaminess, and indolent sentiment. The two together make up that life of practical piety which is the true end and chief glory of the Gospel. Tit. ii. 12, 13.—J. L.] Jesus, the Deliverer from the future wrath: 1. The wrath cometh; the world is going on to meet the judgment: an irrefragable matter of fact. On one hand, Roos: When the unbelieving world looks out to the time after death, it sees nothing, hopes for nothing, fears nothing, except when conscience is stirred; whereas there is to be feared a fearful wrath of God, which at the appearing of Christ shall wholly burst over it, and, even before that, will make the condition of the soul separated from the body an unhappy condition. On the other hand, Rieger: The wrath of God, its revelation against all ungodliness of men, judgment on hidden sins, is already written deep in the consciences of all men. Under that wrath abide, and are even already grievously tormented by the fear of it in this world and the next, all who are not begotten again by the gospel unto hope. 2. In Christ is deliverance from the judgment. Calvin: It is an invaluable privilege that believers, as often as the judgment is spoken of, know that Christ will come for their deliverance.—The same: The wrath of God is a future thing. We are not to measure it by our present afflictions in the world, as nothing is more absurd than to snatch at the enjoyment of transitory blessings, by way of forming an estimate of the grace of God. Faith is the sight of the invisible, and so is not misled by the aspect of the present life. Whilst the ungodly revel in their security, and we languish in sorrow, let us learn to fear the vengeance of God that is hidden from the eyes of the flesh, and rest in the calm pleasures of the spiritual life!

[Vaughan: The three phrases are equally scriptural, (1) *Christ saved*, (2) *Christ saves*, (3) *Christ will save*. Comp. (1) Rom. viii. 24; Eph. ii. 5; 2 Tim. i. 9. (2) 1 Cor. i. 18; xv. 2. (3) Matt. xxiv. 13; Mark xiii. 13; Phil. ii. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 10; Heb. ix. 28; 1 Pet. i. 5.—J. L.]

[There is a discourse by bishop Sherlock on vv. 9, 10.—J. L.]

Ch. II. 1–12.

3. a. The Thessalonians are themselves witnesses, that the Apostle's was no vain entrance, but one of Divine power (vv. 1, 2). As he exercises his ministry generally, with no impurity of purpose or method, but, as one put in trust by God, before the eyes of God (vv. 3, 4), so in Thessalonica also he appeared in no flattering or selfish spirit (vv. 5, 6), but with the most generous love (vv. 7, 8) and self-denying labor (v. 9). They themselves and God are his witnesses, that he had shown himself throughout unblamable towards the believers, whilst he was careful about nothing else but, as a father, to exhort every individual to a walk worthy of God (vv. 10-12).

1 For yourselves, brethren, know [yourselves know, brethren,][1] our entrance
2 in [entrance, εἴσοδον] unto you, that it was not in vain [hath not been vain][2]; but
even after that we had suffered before and were shamefully entreated [but hav-
ing before suffered, and been shamefully treated],[3] as ye know, at [in, ἐν]
Philippi, we were bold in our God to speak unto you the gospel of God with
3 [in, ἐν] much contention. For our exhortation *was* [*is*],[4] not of deceit [delusion][5]
4 nor [yet][6] of uncleanness, nor[7] in guile; but as [according as, καθώς] we were
allowed of God [have been approved by God][8] to be put in trust with the gospel,
even so [so, οὕτω] we speak; not as pleasing men, but God,[9] which trieth [who
5 proveth][10] our hearts. For neither at any time used we words of flattery, as ye
6 know; nor a cloak of covetousness, God is witness; nor of men sought we
[sought we of men][11] glory, neither of [from, ἀπό] you, nor *yet* of [nor from, οὔτε
ἀπό] others, when we might have been burdensome [*or:* have used authority],[12]
7 as the apostles of Christ [Christ's apostles, Χριστοῦ ἀπόστολοι]; but we were [were
found][13] gentle[14] among you [in the midst of you, ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν], even as a nurse
8 cherisheth her children [as a nurse would cherish her own children];[15] so [,][16]
being affectionately desirous[17] of you, we were willing to have imparted [to impart]
unto you not the gospel of God only [not only the gospel of God],[18] but also our
9 own souls, because ye were [became][19] dear unto us. For ye remember, brethren,
our labor [toil, κόπον] and travail: for laboring [working][20] night and day, because
we would not be chargeable [that we might not be burdensome, πρὸς τὸ μὴ
10 ἐπιβαρῆσαι] to any of you, we preached unto you the gospel of God. Ye are
witnesses, and God *also* [and God], how holily and justly [righteously, δικαίως]
and unblameably we behaved ourselves among you that believe [to, *or* for you,
11 who believed];[21] as [even as, καθάπερ] ye know how we exhorted, and comforted
[encouraged],[22] and charged [adjured][23] [you, ὑμᾶς] every one of you, as a father
12 *doth* his children [as a father his own children],[24] that ye would walk [should

walk][25] worthy [in a manner worthy, ἀξίως] of God, who hath called [calleth][26] you unto [into, εἰς] His [His own, ἑαυτοῦ] kingdom and glory.

[1] V. 1.—[The Greek order, retained by most of the old English versions.—J. L.]
[2] V. 1.—[κενὴ γέγονεν; German: *eitel gewesen ist*. The reference is not to the results (Robinson and many others: *fruitless, useless*, &c., as in ch. iii. 5, εἰς κενόν), but, like the rest of this section, to the character of the Apostle's ministry. This is one of the cases in which Wiclif and Rheims are kept right by the Vulgate.—J. L.]
[3] V. 2.—καί before προπαθόντες must be erased. [All the late critical editions omit it, on overwhelming evidence, including Sin.—J. L.]
[4] V. 3.—[λαλοῦμεν of v. 4 shows that in this sentence the writer characterizes his ordinary preaching, and not particularly that at Thessalonica.—J. L.]
[5] V. 3.—[πλάνης, *error*, as it is here rendered by many, and always elsewhere in our Common Version, except at 2 Thess. ii. 11, *delusion*. Auberlen, after De Wette, Lünemann, Koch: *Irrwahn*.—J. L.]
[6] V. 3.—[See Ellicott's note, p. 149 sq., on "the appropriate rendering in the different cases of continued negation." —J. L.]
[7] V. 3.—Instead of οὔτε, A. B. C. D. F. G. [Sin.] and some minuscules have here also οὐδέ, which Lachmann, De Wette, Lünemann [Hahn, Winer, Olshausen, Koch, Wordsworth, Alford's last edition, Ellicott, who admits, however, that the reading is very doubtful.—J. L.] prefer; comp. Winer, p. 437. Yet the correspondent οὐδέ may be also a correction, and accordingly Tischendorf has in the seventh edition gone back to οὔτε.
[8] V. 4.—[δεδοκιμάσμεθα ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. For the rendering of the verb, comp. Rom. ii. 18; 1 Cor. xvi. 3; Phil. i. 10. The tense also should be allowed its full force as a perfect.—J. L.]
[9] V. 4.—[The τῷ before Θεῷ is bracketed by Lachmann, and cancelled by Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott, after B. C. D.[1] Sin., &c.—J. L.]
[10] V. 4.—[τῷ δοκιμάζοντι, a repetition of the previous verb, in a modified sense; comp. E. V. at ch. v. 21, and often elsewhere. In v. 5 κολακείας is in Sin. κολακίας.—J. L.]
[11] V. 6.—οὔτε ζητοῦντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δόξαν. The Greek order is here followed by nearly all versions, English and foreign.—J. L.]
[12] V. 6.—[This marginal rendering of E. V. is substantially that adopted by the majority of interpreters from Ambrosiaster to Alford, Ellicott, and Auberlen: *uns ein Ansehen geben*. Ellicott quotes Chrysostom as decidedly in favor of the same interpretation, whereas Chrysostom expressly includes the other reference also (preferred by many from Theodoret to Webster and Wilkinson): ἐνταῦθα δὲ καὶ περὶ χρημάτων φησὶ τὸ, δυνάμενοι ἐν βάρει εἶναι κτλ. Others in like manner allow either interpretation, or combine the two. See *Revision*.—J. L.]
[13] V. 7.—[ἀλλ' (B. Sin. ἀλλά) ἐγενήθημεν. See ch. i. 5, Critical Note 6.—J. L.]
[14] V. 7.—Lachmann's νήπιος [νήπιοι], *childlike*, which arose from drawing over the ν from the preceding word, and as destroying the unity of the figure, must be rejected. [It has, however, very considerable support from manuscripts (B. C.[1] D.[1] F. G. Sin.[1]), versions, and Fathers.—J. L.]
[15] V. 7.—[ὡς ἂν τροφὸς θάλπῃ τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα. Webster and Wilkinson: "as a nurse (any nurse) would."—Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott: ἐάν, after B. C. D. E. F. G. &c., but not Sin.[1] Many, including Auberlen, have a colon or a period after ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, and attach this clause as protasis to what follows in v. 8. Erasmus, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth, Ellicott, place a comma before and after it, Ellicott regarding the clause "both as an illustration of the preceding words, and as the protasis to the following." But this divided duty is somewhat distracting. The simile of the nursing mother no doubt suggests what is said in v. 8, but can scarcely be a grammatical protasis to it, and yet maintain a structural connection with what precedes. On the whole, I prefer the arrangement of our English Version, and would close v. 7 with at least a semicolon.—J. L.]
[16] V. 8.—[οὕτως qualifies εὐδοκοῦμεν, not ὁμειρόμενοι.—J. L.]
[17] V. 8—Instead of ἱμειρόμενοι the common reading now is ὁμειρόμενοι [all the uncials, and many cursives.—J. L.]
[18] V. 8.—[The Greek order, followed by Wiclif and Rheims, and later versions generally.—J. L.]
[19] V. 8.—[ἐγενήθητε, the reading of recent critical editions, is sustained by abundant uncial authority, including Sin. The *recepta* γεγένησθε may have been an accommodation to the supposed present time of εὐδοκοῦμεν.—J. L.]
[20] V. 9.—[ἐργαζόμενοι].—γάρ after νυκτός should be cancelled [as it now is in nearly all critical editions. It is wanting in A. B. D[1]. F. G. Sin.—J. L.].
[21] V. 10.—[ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, participle of the imperfect, not, as English Version, Ellicott, &c., of the present. German: *euch, den Glaubenden*; and similarly many others, from the Syriac to Lünemann. Comp. ch. i. 7.—For the import of the dative, see Exeget. Notes.—J. L.]
[22] V. 11.—[παραμυθούμενοι must have the same relation to v. 12 as the other two participles between which it stands.—J. L.]
[23] V. 11.—The reading μαρτυρούμενοι is indeed better attested than -όμενοι [this, which was doubtful before, can no longer be allowed, now that -όμενοι is sustained by Sin.—J. L.], and was therefore at first favored by Lachmann and Tischendorf. But by the latter, with De Wette, Lünemann [Bengel, Schott, Bloomfield, Alford, Ellicott], &c., it has again been abandoned with reason, since μαρτυρεῖσθαι is only used passively [some reading μαρτυρόμενος also at Acts xxvi. 22.—J. L.], and the mistake might easily occur in copying, from the similarity in sound to παραμυθούμενοι. [Latin versions generally use *obtestor*; German versions, *beschwören* or *bezeugen*; Rhemish and Conybeare, *to adjure*; Alford, *to conjure*, &c. J. L.]
[24] V. 11.—[ὡς πατὴρ τέκνα ἑαυτοῦ. In Greek the verse is arranged thus: "Even as ye know how every one of you, as a father his own children, we exhorted you, and encouraged, and adjured." All the accusatives are dependent on the participles, and therefore Ellicott's translation: "Even as ye know how in regard of every one of you *we did so*, as a father toward his own children, exhorting you and encouraging *you*, and charging *you*," is wanting in his usual exactness.—J. L.]
[25] V. 12.—[For περιπατῆσαι of the *textus receptus*, Scholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth, Ellicott, read περιπατεῖν, on large authority of manuscripts uncial (including Sin.) and cursive.—J. L.]
[26] V. 12.—[καλοῦντος. A. and Sin., with a few cursive manuscripts, read καλέσαντος.—J. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. (V. 1.) **For yourselves know.**—For the confirmation and clearer elucidation (γάρ) of the statement of the foreign brethren regarding his entrance at Thessalonica (ch. i. 9), the Apostle now appeals at length, as he had done cursorily at ch. i. 5, to the recollection of the Thessalonians themselves on the subject. Hence the same expressions, εἴσοδος πρὸς ὑμᾶς. We might call ch. ii. 1-12 an explanation of the ὁποίαν, ch. i. 9, just as the πῶς ἐπεστρέψατε is then carried out in ch. ii. 13-16. The third testimony, that of the Thessalonians themselves, serves to establish the second, that of the strangers, just as the latter serves to establish the first (comp. on ch. i. 8, Note 1). That ch. ii. 1 begins with the same αὐτοὶ γάρ as ch. i. 9 is, of course, accidental; our αὐτοί does not stand opposed to that αὐτοί as such (that, indeed, has quite another reference, to ἡμᾶς of v. 8), but to strangers generally, as in the sequel καὶ ἡμεῖς of v. 13 corresponds to it.—The details that follow are, in fact, intelligible only on the supposition, that the Apostle has to confute certain aspersions on his person and ministry. Merely to strengthen the Thessalonians (CALVIN, LÜNEMANN, and most), he would not expatiate so much at large

on the excellencies of his service amongst them, least of all with such solemn protestations (vv. 5, 10) and such frequent appeals to the recollection of the readers (vv. 2, 5, 9, 10, 11); but he enters on boasting for the same reason as in 2 Cor. x.–xiii., because he must defend himself. Only it is not here in Thessalonica any factious doings that he has to contend with, but simply the insinuations whereby the unbelieving Thessalonians sought again to withdraw from the gospel their believing kindred and neighbors. In what these insinuations consisted we learn from the negative clauses, vv. 1, 3, 5 sq. The very fact that nearly our entire section proceeds in clauses with οὐκ and ἀλλά (vv. 1–2, 3–4, 5–9) shows, that Paul (through Timothy) had been informed of false assertions in regard to his operations—falsehoods, to which it was necessary for him to oppose the truth. Already RIEGER has remarked on v. 3: A denial of this kind from the Apostle indicates, that such imputations had been cast on him and his preaching. And says ROOS more precisely: When the Thessalonian converts reflected on the change that had taken place with them, it might possibly occur to them that an unknown man, of the name of Paul, had come to them over the sea with certain companions, had preached of one Jesus whom he called Christ, and of whom they had previously heard nothing, and had exhorted them to believe in Him, and serve Him as their Lord. So now we are Christians, they may have thought, whereas formerly we were Gentiles or Jews. But, in making this change, have we done right? Is the name, the faith, the hope of Christians not a thing of vanity? Are we not suffering for it to no purpose? Has not Paul deceived us? Is it not some falsehood that he has talked to us? And, besides, our countrymen hold his teaching to be a fable. These thoughts are now met by Paul in ch. ii. 1–16.

2. **Our entrance unto you, that it hath not been vain.**—This is the first of the imputations. κενή, comp. 1 Cor. xv. 14, = empty, idle, without power or substance, unreal; ŒCUMENIUS: μῦθοι καὶ λῆροι; CALVIN: *vana ostentatio;* comp. ch. i. 5, οὐκ ἐν λόγῳ μόνον, and the antithesis there, as here in v. 2. Not, therefore, = in vain, fruitless (LUTHER, FLATT, &c.), nor yet at once powerless and fruitless (DE WETTE, [JOWETT]), nor again = deceitful, *fallax* (GROTIUS). The γέγονεν, as distinguished from the simple ἦν or even ἐγένετο, expresses the secure consciousness of an accomplished, unassailable fact. In the original the subject of the dependent clause is by a Greek idiom attracted as object into the principal clause.*

3. (V. 2.) **But having before suffered,** &c.—The cause of an idle babbler is one for which he does not submit to suffering, and still less, when he has just with difficulty surmounted one trial, does he again joyfully appear for the same cause, especially in a new conflict. A deep earnestness in suffering, and yet, along with that, an unwearied alacrity and fidelity in his calling, showed Paul to be a man whose appearance the Thessalonians needed only to recall (καθὼς οἴδατε), in order to perceive the vanity of the suspicions alleged against him. Of what sort these were, may be inferred from Acts xvii. 6, 7: ringleaders, flatterers of the people, ambitious persons who sought their own advantage.—On the sufferings which the Apostle, immediately before (προπαθ.) his arrival in Thessalonica, had endured at *Philippi*, see Acts xvi. 12 sqq. Paul adds ὑβρισθέντες, *insultingly treated* (comp. Matt. xxii. 6; Luke xviii. 22), not so much because προπάσχειν like πάσχειν is a *vox media* (LÜNEMANN), but because with his strong sense of right he had peculiarly felt the treatment received by him at Philippi to be arbitrary and unjust; see Acts xvi. 37. To such slight features even extends the harmony between the Acts and our Epistles.

4. **We were bold in our God** &c.—παῤῥησιάζεσθαι, once again in Paul's writings, Eph. vi. 20, and in like manner of the preaching of the gospel; frequently in the Acts, and indeed, except ch. xviii. 26, only of Paul from his conversion onwards, chh. ix. 27, 28; xiii. 46; xiv. 3; xix. 8; xxvi. 26. Freedom and boldness in testimony was therefore a prominent characteristic of this Apostle. OLSHAUSEN: παῤῥησία is the outward expression of πληροφορία (ch. i. 5). Moreover, παῤῥησιάζεσθαι is not here = *to speak or preach freely,* so that λαλῆσαι should be an explanatory infinitive resolvable by: *so that* (DE WETTE, KOCH, [ELLICOTT: *so as to speak*]), or an infinitive of the purpose: *in order that* (Schott); but, as in Acts iii. 46 [?] and xxvi. 26, = *to act with freedom and alacrity,* and λαλῆσαι is simply an infinitive of the object (LÜNEMANN), as in v. 4 πιστευθῆναι. [And so ALFORD, who translates: *We were confident.* ELLICOTT, on the other hand, comparing Eph. vi. 20 and Acts xxvi. 26, agrees with DE WETTE in thinking that "the idea of bold *speech,* even though reiterated in λαλῆσαι, can scarcely be excluded."—J. L.] We had, says Paul, this παῤῥησία, not in ourselves, especially after such experiences, but **in our God** (in whom, as in our spiritual life-element, we live and labor; see ch. i. 1, Doctrinal and Ethical, 1). Not merely was it no idle babbler with whom the Thessalonians had to do; it was not, speaking generally, any mere man, but God; and this God Paul dares to call *his* God, because God visibly owned him, and the Thessalonians perceived in their conscience (2 Cor. iv. 2; v. 11) that in the power of God Paul spoke and acted. Therefore also he purposely adds: **the gospel of God**; he had not brought to them any empty talk, nor any kind of man's word whatsoever (see v. 13), but the glad tidings which God Himself will have proclaimed in the world. Comp. on τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ Exeg. Note 4 to ch. i. 8, ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου. Why Paul does not say: *in Christ, the gospel of Christ,* but *in God, of God,* see Doctr. and Eth., 3.

5. **In much contention.**—As Paul had testified of the Thessalonians, ch. i. 6, that they received the word in much affliction with joy of the Holy Ghost, so here he can testify of himself that in much contention, with joy in God, he had published the same. Ἀγών, not outward and inward contention ([CHRYSOSTOM, BISHOP HALL], OLSHAUSEN, [JOWETT]), but the contention of outward suffering only, Phil. i. 30 (DE WETTE, and most).*

6. (V. 3.) **For our exhortation is** &c.—The verb to be supplied in v. 3 is not ἦν but, as λαλοῦμεν of v. 4 shows, ἐστίν. Paul confirms (γάρ) the statement as to his entrance at Thessalonica by a

* [And so in our English Version; whereas the German thus: *Ye know that our entrance hath,* &c.—J. L.]

* [Including LÜNEMANN, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, VAUGHAN. Yet, since there seems to have been no violent resistance to the preachers at Thessalonica, prior to the sudden outbreak which led to their immediate departure from the city (Acts xvii. 5-10), it is not well thus to restrict the reference. Comp. Paul's use of the word at Col. ii. 1; 1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7. FRITZSCHE and many (LÜNEMANN says, most) understand the word here of the Apostle's cares and sorrows. Why not take in both the inward experience, and the outward?—J. L.]

statement *de toto perpetuoque more suo* (BENGEL). But since this general witness to himself might again also be called in question, people at Thessalonica knowing nothing from their own observation of his ministry elsewhere, it was necessary for him to establish this point likewise by again enlarging, v. 5 sqq., on the spirit and method of his labors in Thessalonica. Similarly Jesus: If ye believe not me, my witness of myself, at least believe my works that are done amongst you (John x. 38; xiv. 11).

7. **Our exhortation** [German: *Predigt*, = preaching, discourse]. Very well LÜNEMANN: *παράκλησις* is *a calling to, address;* and, according to the different relations to which this address is applied, the word undergoes modifications of its meaning. In the case of sufferers it is consolation; directed toward a moral or intellectual need, it is exhortation and encouragement. Now, since even the first evangelical proclamation consists in exhortation and encouragement, to wit, in the summons to renounce sin and lay hold of the offered salvation (comp. 2 Cor. v. 20), *παράκλ.* might also be used generally of the preaching of the gospel; whether objectively of the contents of the discourse, or subjectively of the preaching itself. So here; see v. 4. BENGEL: *totum præconium evangelicum* [*passionum dulcedine tinctum*, as Bengel adds.—J. L.]; OLSHAUSEN: the work generally of Christian teaching. Paul uses this expression and not *εὐαγγέλιον* (ch. i. 5), *λόγος*, *κήρυγμα* (1 Cor. ii. 4), or such like terms, because here the question is about the preaching, not in so far as it is a proclamation, but as it wins and transforms the hearers.*

8. **Not of delusion, nor yet of uncleanness, nor in guile.**—*ἐκ* marks the source from which the preaching proceeds; *ἐν*, the way and manner in which it is performed. The Apostle names two sources, one on the side of knowledge and doctrine, *πλάνη*, and one on the side of disposition, *ἀκαϑαρσία*. He first repels the reproach, as if the Christian faith preached by him were a superstition, a chimera, and he himself an enthusiast or a babbler, like the sorcerers or magicians (CHRYSOST.). Opposed to this is the fact, v. 4, that he had been entrusted with the gospel *by God*. With an *οὐδέ*—a stronger disjunctive than *οὔτε* (*δέ* and *τε*), like our *nor yet*, stronger than *nor* (comp. WINER, p. 432)—Paul passes to the second point. *'Ακαϑαρσία*, impurity, commonly in the sense of unchastity (Rom. i. 24; 2 Cor. xii. 21; Gal. v. 19; Col. iii. 5), but also moral filth and uncleanness generally (Rom. vi. 19); here either an impure mind, foul motives in general, or perhaps it answers better to our *sordid* [*schmutgig*], specially = *covetousness, selfishness* (comp. ch. iv. 7; Eph. iv. 19; v. 3). BENGEL: *ἀκαϑ.* est, *ubi fructus carnis quæritur, cf.* Phil. i. 16, *οὐχ ἁγνῶς.*—*δόλος*, craft, fraud, all kinds of dishonest tricks for cheating and ensnaring. It adds to the impure design the impure means for its accomplishment, and so lies in like manner on the practical side. Whilst, therefore, for the reading *οὐδέ* there may be alleged the difference of the prepositions, yet on internal grounds *οὔτε* is perfectly justifiable (comp. WINER, p. 436 sq. [and Critical Note 7]). In the antithesis likewise, v. 4, *ἀκαϑαρσία* and *δόλος* are taken together in the sentence with *οὕτως*, since *ἀνϑρώποις ἀρέσκοντες* answers to *δόλος* and *ϑεῷ τῷ δοκιμάζοντι τὰς καρδίας* to *ἀκαϑαρσία*. So in the confirmatory verses 5 and 6 the *λόγος κολακείας* answers to *δόλος*, the *πρόφασις πλεονεξίας* and *ζητοῦντες ἐξ ἀνϑρώπων δόξαν* to *ἀκαϑαρσία*. The proof of v. 1, in particular, that is given in v. 3, lies in *οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης*, answering to *κενή* of v. 1; but the confirmatory sentence, just like ch. i. 8, goes beyond that which it confirms, since with *οὐδέ* the Apostle adds new considerations, which are then again themselves confirmed and carried further in v. 5 sqq. This view is supplementary to Note 6.

9. (V. 4.) **According as—so.**—*Καϑώς*, conformably to the fact that; *οὕτως*, according to that very rule: agreeably to the grace conferred and obligation laid upon us (LÜNEMANN).

10. **Approved.**—*Δοκιμάζειν* means, first, to try, test, scrutinize; so at the close of our verse, and commonly in the New Testament, *e.g.* ch. v. 21; 1 Tim. iii. 10, and often; and then also of the result of the trial: to regard as tried, fit, worthy, and to choose accordingly for a position (1 Cor. xvi. 3); hence in the next place generally, to value, prize.* So here, and similarly Rom. i. 28. Paul does not in this mean to assume any worthiness of his own, as the Greek interpreters (CHRYSOSTOM, THEOPHYLACT, ŒCUMENIUS) from their dogmatic standpoint characteristically explain. Rather his aim is just this, to exalt his authority as from God (similarly 1 Tim. i. 12). He would have it understood that, so far is he from preaching human heresy, or considering himself out of his own fancy called to be a preacher (*ἐκ πλάνης*, v. 3), it is rather God Himself who, according to His gracious purpose (GROTIUS, PELT, LÜNEMANN, and even THEODORET [ALFORD: *free choice*]) has vouchsafed to him the distinction of being entrusted with the glad, heavenly message to the world. So in the apodosis with *οὕτως* the main emphasis lies on *ϑεῷ* in opposition to *ἀνϑρώποις*. Comp. v. 2 and note 4; observe also the impressive sonorousness of the expression. The perfect *δεδοκ.* marks what has happened once for all, the security of it as a matter of fact. At the close of the verse Paul purposely uses the same word once again; he knows himself to be the object of a continuous Divine *δοκιμάζειν*. There *δοκ.* is, to try, to examine; yet perhaps not without an accompanying intimation of favorable judgment. In the translation we have sought to indicate this, as well as the identity of the verbs.† *Πιστευϑῆναι*, infinitive of the object, denoting that which was vouchsafed to Paul. So Rom. i. 28. On Paul's frequent construction of *πιστεύεσϑαι*, see Winer, p. 205. That Paul, moreover, here includes Silvanus and Timothy is obvious from the plurals *καρδίας* and *ψυχάς*, v. 8, as LÜNEMANN properly remarks against DE WETTE, who appeals to v. 7 [6], *ἀπόστολοι*; but see Note 16. Of course, however, Paul speaks primarily and chiefly of himself.‡

11. (V. 4.) **Not as pleasing men.**—*'Ως* before the participle gives it a subjective character, that of the conception and intention: We speak not with

* [ELLICOTT: *παράκλησις* is "perhaps distinguishable" from *διδαχή* and *διδασκαλία*, "as directed more to the feelings than the understanding." JOWETT: "The two senses of *παράκλησις*, exhortation and consolation, so easily passing into one another (compare v. 11), are suggestive of the external state of the early Church, sorrowing amid the evils of the world, and needing as its first lesson to be comforted; and not less suggestive of the first lesson of the Gospel to the individual soul, of peace in believing."—J. L.]

* [ELLICOTT states the gradation thus: (a) to put to the test; (b) to choose after testing; (c) to approve of what is so tested. This might perhaps be improved by transposing (b) and (c).—J. L.]

† [German: *von Gott werth geachtet—der unsere Herzen werthet* (*prüfet*).—J. L.]

‡ [And, at most, he *for* them, not they of themselves.—J. L.]

the thought of pleasing men, and so winning them with guile (ἐν δόλῳ, v. 3), but to please God who searcheth our hearts, and so knows and judges even impure designs (ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας, v. 3). Comp. Gal. i. 10.—[ALFORD: "ἀρέσκοντες, in the strict sense of the present tense: *going about to please, striving to please.*"—J. L.]

12. (V. 5.) **For we.**—On the logical relation, expressed by γάρ, of v. 5 sqq. to what precedes, see Notes 6 and 8 (at the end).

13. **Used we words of flattery** &c.—Γίγνεσθαι ἐν, of things ch. i. 5, here of persons (comp. 1 Tim. iv. 15) = *versari in re*, to engage in any matter, be occupied therein. The flattering words thus answer to ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκοντες, v. 4 (CALVIN: Whoever will please men, must basely flatter), and to δόλος, v. 3 (CHRYSOSTOM: We flattered not, as deceivers, who desire merely to draw people to themselves, and rule them). For the fact that he had not flattered them, Paul appeals to the recollection of his readers themselves: *as ye know;* but for what follows, that he had had no selfish aims, he can only appeal to God, who knoweth the heart: *God is witness!* Comp. Rom. i. 9; Phil. i. 8. This appeal answers to θεῷ τῷ δοκιμάζοντι τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν (v. 4), as the repelling of the insinuation, that his mind had been set on earthly good and human glory (v. 6), answers to θεῷ ἀρέσκειν, v. 4, and οὐκ ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας, v. 3. Πλεονεξία corresponds to ἀκαθαρσία, as in ch. iv. 6, 7; Eph. iv. 19; v. 3. Πρόφασις (from προφαίνω, not πρόφημι), properly, *what appears;* hence the pretext, behind which one hides his real thought, an excuse; so here parallel with λόγος: My speech was neither a word of flattery, nor a fair pretext, a plausible form for covetous ends.

14. (V. 6.) **Nor sought we glory.**—Ζητοῦντες likewise is dependent on ἐγενήθημεν, and parallel to ἐν λόγῳ κολ., ἐν προφάσει πλεονεξίας. Such a change of structure is truly Pauline (comp. Rom. xii. 9 sqq.). As to the thought, there is a close connection with the latter point, as of ambition with avarice. On ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δόξαν, comp. John v. 41, 44.

15. **Neither from you, nor from others.**—In vv. 5, 6 there are, first, three mutually coördinate οὔτε, then two subordinate to the clause of the last of these three, since οὔτε ἀφ' ὑμῶν &c. distributes the ἐξ ἀνθρώπων. Ἀπό, essentially = ἐκ, brings to view the special source as distinct from the general.* *From others*, with whom we might perhaps have sought honor for ourselves through your conversion (comp. ch. i. 8, 9). Erroneously BENGEL: *Qui nos admirati essent, si nos superbius tractassemus.*

16. (V. 7 [6].)† **When we might have used authority** [or, **been burdensome**] **as Christ's Apostles.**—The participle δυνάμενοι is subordinated to ζητοῦντες, and is resolvable by *although.* Ἐν βάρει εἶναι: *to be of weight, to appear important, dignified, to assume consequence.* Against the connection, THEODORET, EWALD, and others: *to be burdensome* = ἐπιβαρεῖν, v. 9.‡ Ἀπόστολοι, so far as it refers also to Silvanus and Timothy (see Note 10, at the end), is used in the wider sense, as in Acts xiv. 4, 14 of Paul and Barnabas. But perhaps the old rule holds here: *A potiori fit denominatio.* As Christ's Apostles, as messengers and envoys (ambassadors) of the Anointed King of the whole world, solemnly appointed by God (Acts xvii. 3, 7), they might have stepped forth with dignity. *Dicit Paulus se adeo abfuisse ab inani pompa, a jactantia, a fastu, ut legitimo etiam jure suo cesserit, quod ad vindicandam autoritatem pertinet* (CALVIN).

17. (V. 7.) **But we were found gentle in the midst of you.**—Ἐγενήθημεν answers to the ἐγενήθ. of v. 5. Ἤπιος (from ἔπω, εἶπον, whence then νήπιος, *infans*) properly, *affable, mild, kind, loving* (comp. 2 Tim. ii. 24). *Suavissimum vocabulum, de parentibus præcipue et de medicis dici solitum* (BENGEL). [Ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, in the midst of you, surrounded by you, as a teacher by his pupils, a mother by her children, a hen by her chickens (BENGEL). It marks the centre of a group or society, drawing all eyes to itself (comp. Acts i. 15; Luke ii. 46; Matt. xviii. 2): So that ye have all seen and experienced it (KOCH). RIGGENBACH].* Even this loving demeanor of the Apostle might be interpreted as flattery (v. 5), and so Paul confutes this reproach by showing it to be a perversion of his virtue into a fault. Then by the fuller description, ὡς ἄν &c., of this his tender and devoted love, he at the same time confutes the other reproach (vv. 5, 6) of his having been selfish or ambitious.

18. **As a nurse would cherish her own children.**—Before ὡς there should be a point with the force of our colon,† so that ὡς answers to οὕτως of v. 8. The sentence after ὡς is an explanation attached to what precedes by asyndeton, as in ch. i. 8; ii. 9, yet so that here also again the explanatory sentence contains at the same time an advance, an enlargement of the thought. Τροφός, nourisher, she who suckles; here not a nurse, but the mother herself, as appears from τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα, in which moreover, especially with this arrangement of the words (comp. v. 8; otherwise v. 11), there exists the climactic intimation, her *own* children (see ALEX. BUTTMANN, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachgebrauchs*, 1859, p. 97). With STIER, we have also expressed both in the version.‡ The figure of the mother (comp. Gal. iv. 19; Is. lxvi. 13; xlix. 15) is still tenderer than that of the father (v. 11), but is here chosen especially for this reason, because truly a nursing mother with her child seeks not profit or honor, but is wholly bent on bestowing (not receiving) love. Θάλπειν likewise is a tender expression; properly to warm, then, like *fovere*, to foster and cherish (Eph. v. 29; comp. Deut. xxii. 6, LXX).

* [So LÜNEMANN, and similarly ALFORD (ἐκ, the abstract ground; ἀπό, the concrete object;—a distinction on which he insists against ELLICOTT, who pronounces it "artificial and precarious.") That of SCHOTT, assented to by OLSHAUSEN and BLOOMFIELD, that ἐκ marks the immediate source, ἀπό the mediate, is rejected by LÜNEMANN as here impossible. But, even if the two prepositions must be regarded in this place as synonymous, it is desirable that the translation should indicate the change. WEBSTER and WILKINSON: "derived from men, whether tendered on your part or on the part of others."—J. L.]

† [The latter half of v. 6 in our English Version is in Luther's Bible attached to v. 7.—J. L.]

‡ [MACKNIGHT adopts the rendering of the English margin, but understands the Apostle to speak of his right to exact both obedience and maintenance. Perhaps, however, the other phrase, *to be burdensome*, no less admits of either reference, and it has the advantage of preserving—somewhat too strongly, indeed—the verbal affinity between vv. 6 and 9. Comp. Critical Note 12.—J. L.]

* [ALFORD and ELLICOTT find in ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν "a hint at the absence of all assumption of authority, 'as one of yourselves,'" and cite CHRYSOSTOM, ŒCUMENIUS, and ZANCHIUS to the same effect.—J. L.]

† [But see Critical Note 15.—J. L.]

‡ [*wie eine säugende Mutter ihre eigenen Kinder pflegt.* It is obvious, however, that the maternal relation is indicated solely by the ἑαυτῆς τέκνα, and is not at all necessarily implied in τροφός. AUGUSTINE, *Serm. de Ps.* lxxii. 24 (lxxiii. 23): "Apostolus vero, germano et pio caritatis affectu, et nutricis personam suscepit, dicendo, fovet; et matris, addendo, filios suos. Sunt enim nutrices foventes quidem, sed non filios suos: item sunt matres nutricibus dantes, non foventes filios suos."—J. L.]

19. (V. 8.) **So, being affectionately desirous of you, we were willing.**—Ὁμειρόμενοι, supported here by the best manuscripts, occurs in the New Testament only here, and but seldom elsewhere, in the LXX, &c.; in meaning it is = ἱμειρεσθαι (*Recepta*), and, like this, probably an enlarged form of μείρεσθαι, which should perhaps be distinguished from the ordinary μείρεσθαι (see Passow), and is used by Nicander in the sense of the common ἱμείρεσθαι (comp. WINER, p. 92) = *ardently to long after any one, to love tenderly.**—Εὐδοκοῦμεν is the imperfect without augment, as frequently; WINER, p. 66: *we were pleased, were cheerfully ready, took delight therein* (comp. 2 Cor. v. 8; Rom. xv. 26). In vv. 7 and 8 one feels in word and figure the tender heartiness and sweet breath of a first, fresh love, such as becomes the firstling of the apostolical Epistles.

20. **To impart unto you** &c.—Μεταδοῦναι stands emphatically forward, in order to mark the love as one altogether giving, imparting. The two objects of μεταδοῦναι are joined to one another ascensively by *not only—but also*, so that the second is held up as the one of greater importance for the connection (τοῦτο μεῖζον ἐκείνου, CHRYSOSTOM). Ἑαυτῶν, moreover, is opposed to τοῦ Θεοῦ, and the Apostle means to say: We were willing not only to fulfil our official service, entrusted to us by God, in delivering to you His gospel, but there was formed also a personal relation of the most devoted love, in consequence of which we were ready to sacrifice to you our own life.† [WEBSTER and WILKINSON: " 'not only that which you could share without loss to me, but that which I must lose in giving;' or, 'not only that which I held in trust for others, had in charge to give, but that which was most my own.' "—J. L.] The latter point was here the main thing, over against the imputations of covetousness and ambition. The comparison with the mother has reference to this personal love, which is therefore still made specially prominent in the additional clause with διότι (stronger and more distinctive than ὅτι), which assigns the motive. How far now Paul with his attendants willingly gave up his own life to the Thessalonians, he shows himself by an example in v. 9, which is joined to what precedes, by γάρ, and is therefore illustrative of it. At the risk of health and life, he performed along with his preaching strenuous manual labor day and night, that he might be burdensome to no one, just as a mother day and night with much labor and self-sacrifice cherishes her little child. Add to this, that the Apostle—and it is of himself that he speaks at least primarily—was probably of a weak and sickly constitution (2 Cor. x. 10; xii. 5 sqq.), and we shall the better understand how much there was here of a μεταδοῦναι τὴν ψυχήν. Μεταδοῦναι is indeed zeugmatic, since out of it only the simple δοῦναι must be supplied to τὰς ψυχὰς (comp. Matt. xx. 28); but such constructions are frequent enough (see WINER, p. 548). On ἑαυτῶν = ἡμῶν αὐτῶν, see WINER, p. 136. [BENGEL's paraphrase: *Anima nostra cupiebat quasi immeare in animam vestram*—and similarly CHRYSOSTOM: τὰς ψυχὰς εἰς ὑμᾶς κενῶσαι, *effundere*—though suitable to μεταδοῦναι, is opposed to the γάρ of v. 9. and perhaps also contains a thought not quite apostolic, and only in seeming accord with the figure of the mother, since not the suckling as such, but the θάλπειν is the *tertium comparationis.* To think of the gospel as the milk, according to 1 Pet. ii. 2; comp. Heb. v. 13 (DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN, and others), is quite as little in keeping, since it is really not the Apostle's gospel, but is expressly called the gospel of God, and since for that very reason, as has been pointed out, this consideration does not enter into the comparison with a mother. In μεταδοῦναι τὰς ψυχὰς the exposure of the life in danger and persecutions is commonly thought of; nor is this excluded, since v. 9 contains merely an illustrative example, such as was required by the context, and was fitted to repel the imputation of covetousness and ambition.—RIGGENBACH.]

21. (V. 9.) **For ye remember our toil and travail.**—Μνημονεύετε, more sonorous than οἴδατε (vv. 1, 2, 5, 11); here with an accusative; ch. i. 3, with a genitive.—On γάρ, see Note 20. [The reference of γάρ to ἤπιοι ἐγενήθημεν, v. 7, is too remote; that to ἀγαπητοὶ ἡμῖν ἐγενήθητε (LÜNEMANN), unsuitable.—RIGGENBACH.] Κόπος is strengthened by the addition of μόχθος,* as at 2 Thess. iii. 8 (a verse which agrees almost verbally with ours), and 2 Cor. xi. 27. The expressions in their connection denote the most strenuous bodily labor at his handicraft as σκηνοποιός (Acts. xviii. 3), a maker of tents out of leather or cloth for shepherds, travellers, soldiers, &c. (WINER, *Realwörterbuch* II. pp. 213,725). This κόπος and μόχθος is now explained in a sentence appended, as in v. 7, by asyndeton (γάρ after νυκτός being spurious), in which the emphasis lies on what stands foremost, νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐργαζόμενοι, as in v. 8 on τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχάς. And now, as ἐκηρύξαμεν εἰς ὑμᾶς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ plainly answers to τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ of v. 8, so does νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐργαζόμενοι to τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχάς, so that there accrues from this a new and more precise confirmation of our view of the γάρ and of μεταδοῦναι τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχάς.

22. **Working night and day.**—Ἐργάζεσθαι, of manual labor, as ch. iv. 11, and often. We [Germans] say *day and night*, as ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός, Luke xviii. 7; Acts ix. 24, and frequently in the Apocalypse; but elsewhere, and always in Paul's usage [both in his letters and speeches, ch. iii. 10; 2 Thess. iii. 8; 1 Tim. v. 5; 2 Tim. i. 3; Acts xx. 31; xxvi. 7.—J. L.], νυκτὸς καὶ ημέρας or νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν, because the Jews, as also the Athenians, begin the civil day with the evening. Here this order is emphatic,† because night-work is the more unusual and irksome. We are not, therefore, to suppose that Paul preached all day, and performed

* [ELLICOTT prefers to regard μείρομαι as an apocopated, and ὁμείρομαι as a late and perhaps strengthened, form of ἱμείρομαι. To the derivation from μείρομαι, WORDSWORTH objects the aspirated ὁ, and he adheres strongly to THEOPHYLACT's account of the word as from ὁμοῦ and εἴρω, = "προσδεδεμένοι, *bound to, twined together* with you, and *clinging to you.*"—J. L.]

† [Our German, after Luther, gives *Leben* for ψυχάς; and this interpretation is given by very many, including the English margin; comp. 1 John iii. 16, &c. But says ELLICOTT: There is "perhaps a faint reference to the deeper meaning of ψυχή, as pointing to the centre of the personality—our lives and souls (Fell), our very existences, and all things pertaining to them."—J. L.]

* [ELLICOTT: "The former perhaps marks the toil on the side of the *suffering* it involves (see on 1 Tim. iv. 10), the latter, as derivation seems to suggest (connected with μόγις, and perhaps allied to μέγας, see Pott, *Etym. Forsch.* Vol. I. p. 283), on the side of the *magnitude* of the obstacles it has to overcome." Nearly opposite to this is Wordsworth: "The former word expresses *energy of action*, the other indicates *patience* in bearing." ALFORD: "No distinction can be established."—J. L.]

† [So ALFORD. But the correctness of the remark may be questioned, since Paul, as is mentioned above, observes the same order everywhere else.—J. L.]

manual labor in the night-time; on the contrary, the latter occupation filled up also a good part of the day, as on the other hand he preached likewise at night (Acts xx. 7); but, generally, *day and night* is, as with us, a vivid expression for *without intermission* (comp. especially Rev. xx. 10).

23. **That we might not be burdensome to any of you,** by his having to care for my support. So little did the Apostle seek any profit from the Thessalonians, that he sought not even the necessaries of life from them but earned them for himself, that his intercourse with them might on his part be altogether one of giving. *In hac etiam parte jure suo obstinuit* (CALVIN; comp. Note 16). For the matter in question, comp. Acts xviii. 3; xx. 34; 1 Cor. iv. 12; ix. 7 sqq.; 2 Cor. xi. 8 sqq.; Phil. iv. 10 sqq., and Doctr. and Eth., 5.—On *κηρύττειν εἰς*, see Winer, p. 191.*

24. (V. 10.) **Ye are witnesses and God.**—The Apostle having in three sentences with *οὐκ—ἀλλά* (vv. 1 and 2, 3 and 4, 5 9) confuted the reproaches cast upon him, and which are summed up in the fewest words in v. 3—having shown that his doctrine is not an idle delusion, but the gospel of God, and that he himself has labored, not from selfish motives of covetousness and ambition, nor with impure methods of craft and flattery, but in the sight of God and with the most devoted love—he now at last opposes to that a brief, positive sketch of his ministry, and for this he again appeals to the Thessalonians and God as witnesses (comp. v. 5), by way of giving to his assertion so much the more of the impressive earnestness of truth. Men must witness for his manner of acting; God witnesses, in his conscience and theirs, for his inward disposition. This explanatory sentence likewise is added by asyndeton (comp. vv. 7, 9), a construction to which in the present instance the liveliness of emotion also contributes.

25. **How holily, and righteously, and unblamably,** &c.—*Ὁσίως*, with perceptible, inward reverence of God; *δικαίως*, with due consideration of men, leaving and giving to every one his own (comp. Eph. iv. 24; Tit. ii. 12 [Luke i. 75; Tit. i. 8]); † *ἀμέμπτως*, unblamably, irreproachably in the whole deportment—the negative side to the two positive ones (LÜNEMANN), especially to *δικαίως* (OLSHAUSEN). This qualification Paul adds, because reproaches had been cast upon him.‡ [BENGEL and others: *toward themselves*, in order to get the three references to God, men, themselves as in Tit. ii. 12; but this is here inadmissible, since all is referred to *ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσι*—*ὁσίως* assigning merely the religious ground of the behavior toward the believers.—RIGGENBACH.] It is commonly not enough considered, that we have here before us, not adjectives, but adverbs (comp. Acts xx. 18., *πῶς ἐγενόμην μεθ' ὑμῶν*); Paul is not speaking of his walk, his entire personal bearing (DE WETTE, HOFMANN)—otherwise we must have had *ὅσιοι*, &c. (comp. *οἷοι*, ch. i. 5)—but of the manner of his dealing with the believers (WINER, p. 413).

26. **To [for] you who believed.**—*ὑμῖν* is simply the dative of direction or reference: *to you, toward you* (DE WETTE, KOCH) [not a dative of interest: *for your advantage*,* nor yet of judgment: *appeared to you* (ŒCUMENIUS and THEOPHYLACT, CALVIN, BENGEL, LÜNEMANN); the adverbs in that case would scarcely be admissible.—RIGGENBACH.].† The addition *τοῖς πιστεύουσιν*, at first view apparently superfluous [JOWETT], must here as at v. 13 have its own ground and significance. The believers were told that their faith was credulity and superstition, that they had allowed themselves to be ensnared, abused, and misled by the stranger, and that this was now called faith. A similar way of talking to that nowadays, which confounds faith with opinion, notion, dim, baseless feeling. In opposition to this Paul dwells with emphasis on the word faith in its true import, and shows how he had never abused their confidence in him and his word so as to indulge himself in impurity of any kind, but rather, honoring their faith as faith in God and His word, he had in all his proceedings kept holy what was holy, and had with all earnest men exhorted them to a walk worthy of God. [Those, who explain the dative as a dative of judgment,‡ take *τοῖς πιστεύουσιν* restrictively: *tametsi aliis non ita videremur*; § BENGEL. Especially contrary to v. 13 (?).—RIGGENBACH.]—*Ἐγενήθημεν*, as in vv. 5, 7; chap. i. 5.

27. (V. 11.) **Whilst we, as ye know, &c. [Even as ye know how we,** &c.]—*Καθάπερ οἴδατε* is a parenthetical clause similar to *καθὼς οἴδατε* of vv. 2, 5; it belongs to the following participial construction. This time the Apostle puts *καθάπερ* for *καθώς*, because immediately after *ὡς* occurs twice. The first *ὡς* belongs to *ἕνα ἕκαστον*, and has here a strengthening force such as it carries also elsewhere in connection with *ἕκαστος* (see Passow under *ἕκαστος*), a usage very nearly akin to the connection of *ὡς* with superlatives. The corroboration *εἷς ἕκαστος*, of frequent occurrence in the New Testament, is found likewise in classic Greek (A. BUTTMANN, p. 105). With the double reënforcement, *ὡς εἷς ἕκαστος*, comp. Rev. xxi. 21; *ἀνὰ εἷς ἕκαστος*; Eph. v. 33: *ὑμεῖς οἱ καθ' ἕνα ἕκαστος*. The participial clauses, vv. 11, 12, show to what extent Paul behaved holily and righteously and unblamably toward the believers (v. 10), and we have therefore resolved the participles by *in that*.‖ The main em-

* [But WINER there reverts to LUTHER's *unter euch*, instead of the preferable *an* of previous editions; and AUBERLEN's own version has simply the dative: *verkündigten wir euch*. It may also be noted here that, for *εἰς ὑμᾶς*, the Cod. Sin. *a prima manu* reads *ὑμῖν*.—J. L.]

† [BENGEL: *Sancte* in rebus *divinis*, *juste* erga *homines*—the classical distinction between *ὁσίως* and *δικαίως*, but not always to be pressed in the N. T.—J. L.]

‡ [ELLICOTT: "Perhaps it is safer to say that *ὁσίως* and *δικαίως* form on the positive side a compound idea of holy purity and righteousness, whether towards God or towards men, while *ἀμέμπτως* states on the negative side the general blamelessness in both aspects and relations."—J. L.]

* [An interpretation suggested by MUSCULUS, allowed by BAUMGARTEN, and adopted by ELLICOTT (whose version, however, *to you that believe*, does not convey that idea).—J. L.]

† [The objection drawn from the adverbs to the construction of *ὑμῖν* as a *dat. judicii*—a construction followed also by ALFORD, who cites 2 Pet. iii. 14—is plausible only when, by an arbitrary rendering of the verb, as = *appeared*, *were thought*, the idea of judgment is transferred to it from the dative.—J. L.]

‡ [German: *als Dativ des Vortheils* = as a dative of interest. But this must be a misprint for *Urtheils*.—J. L.]

§ [Sometimes also they restrict *ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστ.* to *ἀμέμπτως* (SYRIAC, THEODERET, ŒCUMENIUS, CALVIN, &c.). The Greek order is this: "Ye are witnesses, and God, how holily and righteously and unblamably to (for) you who believed we behaved." Probably the precise import of the dative in this case must be left doubtful. ELLICOTT's objection to it as a dative of judgment, that "the Apostle would scarcely have appealed to God in reference to the judgment of the Thessalonians," is by no means decisive. Solemnly to remind converts of their earliest convictions and first love is a Scripture means of guarding them, or recovering them, from declension and apostasy. Comp. Gal. iv. 14, 15; Rev. ii. 3, 5; &c.—J. L.]

‖ [*in dem wir, wie ihr ja wisset*, &c.—J. L.]

phasis of the participial construction rests on the conclusion, *εἰς τὸ περιπατεῖν ἀξίως*, &c. (LÜNEMANN), and yet so that Paul would in connection therewith lay stress on two other considerations: 1. That he had taken pains to hold every one in particular to this worthy walk, and hence the doubly strengthened *ἕκαστος*; 2. That for this end he had exerted all his force of speech, and hence the combination of the three sonorous participles. The Apostle's unblamable deportment towards the believers was shown in his exhorting every individual with the whole power of his address to nothing else but a walk worthy of God. This is simply the connection of v. 10 with vv. 11, 12. The comparison with a *father* has reference to all three points: a father keeps his children singly in his eye, and trains every one according to his individuality; he employs all the force of exhortation in kindness and severity; he would keep his children only to what is good, and to no evil of any kind. Here, where the question is not, as in vv. 7, 8, about devoted love, but holy earnestness, Paul compares himself, not to a mother, but to a father. Paul never writes tautologically, but, even while repeating similar thoughts, advances to new and wider points of view. [Interpreters in general do not agree with me in regarding *καθάπερ οἴδατε* as a parenthesis, but take *οἴδατε* as a governing verb, on which *ὡς*, apart from *ἕνα ἕκαστον*, is dependent. But since *ὡς* is followed only by participles, they are obliged to supply the *verbum finitum*, and then, because *ὑμᾶς* is afterwards added, *ἠγαπήσαμεν, οὐχ* [*οὐκ*] *ἀφήκαμεν*, &c., is supplied to *ἕνα ἕκαστον* (PELT, SCHOTT, and others), or to the entire clause *ἦμεν* (BEZA, GROTIUS, FLATT), or *ἐγενήθημεν*, from the previous context (BENGEL, LÜNEMANN, [ALFORD, WORDSWORTH]), or, the supplement being left indeterminate, an anacoluthon is assumed (DE WETTE, [ELLICOTT]). With these grammatical inconveniences there is then connected also an erroneous and artificial view of the logical relation of vv. 11, 12 to v. 10, as that Paul speaks in v. 10 of his behavior generally; in vv. 11, 12, for confirmation of that, of the discharge of his duty as a teacher in particular (DE WETTE, KOCH, similarly HOFMANN); or that in proof of his own virtue he adduces the fact of his having exhorted the Thessalonians to virtue, it being here taken for granted that one, who has it so much at heart that others shall be virtuous, will be so himself (LÜNEMANN). Independently of other objections to these views, they would require a *καί* after *καθάπερ* or after *ὡς*.—RIGGENBACH.] *

28. **Exhorted and encouraged and adjured.**—*ὑμᾶς* is superfluous † after *ὡς ἕνα ἕκαστον ὑμῶν*; similar repetitions in the classics and also in the New Testament, Col. ii. 13; ‡ Matt. viii. 1; and often (Winer, p. 531). *Παρακαλεῖν*, to exhort generally; *παραμυθεῖσθαι*, kindly to encourage; *μαρτύρεσθαι*, earnestly and solemnly to obtest, like *διαμαρτύρεσθαι*, 1 Tim. v. 21; 2 Tim. ii. 14; iv. 1. BENGEL: *Παρακαλ. movet, ut facias aliquid* (*libenter*); *παραμυθ., ut cum gaudio; μαρτυρ., ut cum timore.* The two last participles really specify the twofold style and method of the *παρακαλεῖν*, and may be also grammatically subordinated to it, as, for example, *δυνάμενοι* of v. 7 [6] is subordinated to *ζητοῦντες* of v. 6, and *κωλυόντων* of v. 16 to *μὴ ἀρεσκόντων καὶ ἐναντίων* of v. 15 (comp. 2 Tim. i. 4). In favor of this are the facts, 1. that *εἰς τὸ περιπατ.* cannot depend on *μαρτυρ.*, which must have either *ἵνα* (1 Tim. v. 21) or the simple infinitive (2 Tim. ii. 14); 2. that *ὑμᾶς* is unsuitable to *μαρτυρ.*, which cannot have an accusative of the person after it, except in the here inadmissible sense of *taking one to witness.* Perhaps the pleonastic *ὑμᾶς* is put after *παρακαλοῦντες* for the very purpose of separating the subordinate participles from the superior one. Even as to form, *παραμυθ.* and *μαρτυρ.* belong together as of the middle voice, and are jointly distinguished from the active *παρακαλοῦντες*. Thus: We exhorted you with kindly encouragement as well as with earnest obtestation.* Comp., moreover, on the accumulation of participles Note 27.—The division of verses is here very unapt. †

29. (V. 12.) **That ye should walk in a manner worthy,** &c.—*Εἰς τὸ περιπατ.* is thus dependent on *παρακαλ.*, and denotes the contents or object of the exhortation. [So also LÜNEMANN, who thinks, indeed, that *εἰς* may be referred to all the three participles; but in that case *εἰς* must rather denote the purpose, as DE WETTE and KOCH understand it.—RIGGENBACH.]

With *ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ καλοῦντος* comp. Eph. iv. 1: *ἀξίως τῆς κλήσεως*, Col. i. 10: *ἀξίως τοῦ κυρίου.* The two ideas are here combined. *Καλοῦντος*, present; because the kingdom and glory are still future, so that the call thereto, though it has already gone forth, yet continues till the coming of Christ, when the kingdom and the glory shall be revealed (LÜNEMANN).‡ The participle is even half-substantival, like *ὁ ῥυόμενος*, ch. i. 10.

30. **Into his own kingdom and glory.**—*Magnificum syntheton* (BENGEL). Not a hendiadys: *kingdom of His glory*, or *glory of His kingdom* (KOPPE, OLSHAUSEN, &c.); nor yet: *earthly kingdom* (the Church) *and heavenly glory* (BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS); nor is *δόξα* the glory of the Messianic kingdom (DE WETTE), but, since *ἑαυτοῦ* belongs also to *δόξα*, the glory of God, Rom. v. 2 (LÜNEMANN). Comp. the closing doxology of the Lord's Prayer. *Ἑαυτοῦ* is emphatic by position, as in v. 7 [WEBSTER and WILKINSON: "implying a participation, or the most exalted fellowship and interest in the Divine blessedness."—J. L.]. Paul would here again, at the end of the entire section as at its beginning (vv. 2, 4; see Notes 4 & 10), give prominence to the

* [Notwithstanding the above remarks, I adhere still to the ordinary construction of *καθάπερ οἴδατε, ὡς ἕνα ἕκαστον*, &c. The objections to it are more than counterbalanced by the exceeding awkwardness of the new arrangement proposed. As a parenthesis belonging to what follows it, *καθάπερ οἴδατε* would be strangely misplaced. It is also very improbable that any considerations of euphony determined the use of *καθάπερ* here, instead of *καθώς* (vv. 2, 5; ch. i. 5. See ch. ii. 13, *καθώς ἐστιν ἀληθῶς*). Perhaps it might rather be said, that the former was selected for the sake of still more strongly emphasizing the exactness of the correspondence between the personal and the official conduct of the Apostle.—J. L.]

† [It is wanting in Cod. Sin.—ELLICOTT speaks of it as a "collective *ὑμᾶς*, serving still more clearly to define all that were included—a defining and supplementary accusative, *somewhat* allied to the use of that case in the *σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρος*."—J. L.]

‡ [Some editions repeating *ὑμᾶς* after *συνεζωοποίησε*.—J. L.]

* [Similarly PEILE: "in words both of encouragement and solemn admonition."—It is quite probable that *παρακαλοῦντες* may draw the *ὑμᾶς* to itself as being the generic word. But what is said above more than that is too confidently stated. Certainly there is not another instance in the New Testament of *παρακαλέω* (in the sense of *exhorting*) being followed, any more than *μαρτύρομαι*, by *εἰς τό*. The prevailing construction of the former also is with *ἵνα* or an infinitive.—J. L.]

† [The Greek Testament begins v. 12 with *καὶ μαρτυρόμενοι*.—J. L.]

‡ [VAUGHAN: "A reiterated sound, continued through the individual life."—J. L.]

thought, that it is God with whom believers have to do, and of whom he had been the mere but honest instrument (hence the leading position of ὁσίως in v. 10.—Comp. v. 13).

Thus: God calls you to a participation in His own kingdom, which will appear at Christ's advent, and in His own Divine glory, into which believers then enter through the change [of the living, 1 Cor. xv. 51.—J. L.] or through the (first) resurrection. It might be asked whether βασιλεία here is not to be taken in the active sense = kingly dominion; yet this signification of βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ does not, to my knowledge, occur in the New Testament. But certainly the participation of Christians in the βασιλεία will really be a participation in the βασιλεύειν. Their calling is indeed to be glorified (Rom. viii. 17), not, however, to be ruled over, but to the βασιλεύειν or συμβασιλεύειν (Rom. v. 17; 1 Cor. iv. 8; 2 Tim. ii. 12; Rev. xx. 4, 6; xxii. 5).—The motive to a holy walk is therefore a double one, which yet again is but one and the same: Christians are to walk worthily, that is, they should regulate all their proceedings and life-conduct in such a way as becomes 1. the holy majesty of God, with whom by their calling they have fellowship: and 2. their own destination, expressed in this calling, to a share in the full dignity, imperial and essential, of this same God. This pure light of glory excludes all impurity (comp. 1 Tim. i. 11, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς δόξης, in connection with the preceding verses, and 1 John iii. 3). This section also, like the one before it, thus closes with an eschatological outlook. And, in truth, there meets us here the high practical importance of the Christian hope. As in suffering it begets patience (ch. i. 3), so in action a holy walk.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. (Vv. 1-12.) To the Thessalonians assailed on account of their faith Paul shows that there is something real about it, both in his case (vv. 1-12) and in theirs (vv. 13-16). As proof he here cites, not miracles, as, for example, in Gal. iii. 5, but simply the demonstration of the spirit and of power—what of Divine, self-evidencing light they had perceived in him, and experienced in their own hearts and consciences. It is worthy of note that the Gentile Apostle, in the very first Epistle written by him for the Gentile world, insists on this. And such is still to-day the *twofold evidence of Christianity* in the midst of a world estranged from God, where so frequently all power, all culture, all historical life stands, or seems to stand, in opposition to the gospel: the children of light, in whom, as nowhere else in the world, we perceive a perfect and blessed life (Matt. v. 14-16; Phil. ii. 15), and the purifying and quickening Divine influences which we experience in ourselves from the gospel (2 Cor. xiii. 5).

2. Our section is rich in *self-praise*, which, however, develops itself rather, step by step, as *self-defence*. A servant of Christ owes it, not so much to himself as his Master and his cause, to clear himself of unjust imputations, whenever they threaten to hinder the progress of the gospel, and prejudice the faith and love of the brethren. How in such a case one should express and demean himself may be learned from Paul, who first of all lets it be seen that he is Divinely certain of his cause, and is conscious of having acted with self-denial in the power of God and before the eyes of God, and then also he appeals freely to human testimony. The Lord knows how, by means of the oppositions of the world or other humbling experiences, so to dispose his servants inwardly, that when circumstances are such that the ends of the Divine kingdom require it, they can and ought to speak of themselves in a way, that to the judgment of a merely natural morality appears as self-praise. Here belongs also, for example, the fact that John distinguishes himself as the disciple whom Jesus loved; here belong many expressions in the Psalms and passages of Daniel, as ch. i. 17-20; ix. 2, 3; 2 Cor. x.-xiii.

3. Our section is a true *pastoral mirror*.* In the first and larger half (vv. 1-9) are two principal points of view, one of which concerns the cause, the doctrine; the other the individual, in respect partly of his inner motives, partly of his manner of acting and speaking. 1. For what concerns the doctrine, we must be able to testify that it is no misleading error, no idle, impotent human invention of any sort, that we preach, but the gospel of God, the glad tidings which God Himself would have to be published to men. We speak in the consciousness, and in the power, of a Divine commission, not as those who are enthusiastic for some self-contrived, human system, and such like, nor as idle babblers believing nothing. 2. For what concerns, *a.* the disposition and purpose in the discharge of the office, we know that we are free from impure motives of avarice and ambition, for we prosecute our work for souls in the continual presence of Him who knows the heart, and, to please whom, we have to prosecute it earnestly, and in fervent love to those entrusted to us. That we may offer no hindrance to the gospel, we willingly forego the honor and profit that we might otherwise properly claim. We are not satisfied with the faithful fulfilment of what is officially prescribed, but voluntarily undertake additional toil and trouble of every kind. We spare not our health or our life, where the honor of our Lord and the salvation of souls are concerned. In short, instead of seeking aught for ourselves, the soul of our work is self-sacrificing love. It is more blessed to give than to receive. *b.* As regards the means and manner of our working, we stand in no need of any sort of cunning or spurious pastoral shrewdness to draw the people to us, and secure for ourselves their respect. We never deal in flattering words. We aim not at all at pleasing men.—In the second half (vv. 10-12) Paul exhibits *the holy and righteous behavior of a servant of Christ toward the believers*, and shows how, 1. so far as concerns the Church, this consists in not merely proclaiming the word generally, but in also bringing it near to individual souls, so that in this way the special care of souls is added to preaching. 2. For what concerns the preacher himself, he should put forth all his strength, and in different ways, adapted to occasional circumstances, to individuals and spiritual conditions, point those committed to him to the right way. 3. With regard, finally, to the doctrine, it should aim at nothing else but to hold the hearers to what is good. But in Christianity that which is morally good has a thoroughly religious character. It is a walk worthy of God. Nor does even that exhaust the matter. It is not merely the relation of single souls, or even of the congregation, to God, that is to be held up to believers, but God has a kingdom, a corporate order of life, in which

* Comp. *Lehrer- und Predigerspiegel* 1 *Thess. ii.* 1-12 in ZELLER'S *Monatsblatt von Beuggen*, 1860, No. 10 sqq.

He really shares His glory with the creature. To this kingdom, already founded in Christ, but to be first manifested at His advent, we are called. Our walk should bear in itself the stamp of our so high destiny. We should act from motives drawn from the kingdom and the glory. The preaching, therefore, must teach what the kingdom is, and what the glory (comp. my Discourse: *die biblische Lehre von Reiche Gottes in ihrer Bedeutung für die Gegenwart* [*The Bible Doctrine of the Kingdom of God in its importance for the present time*], Basel, 1859).—Lastly, in our section there is this fact also to be particularly noticed, that the Apostle compares himself in his ministry to a *father* and a *mother:* the latter in the first half, the former in the second. The parental relation, that most original of all human relations (being preceded only by the conjugal), that image of God's relation to men, is itself again the natural, God-given pattern for all other relations of superior and inferior, and so especially also for preachers and and pastors. A servant of Christ has in his own house a constant school for his office. What he feels and does for his own children, the same he should feel and do for his Church. Yet, not merely the earnestness of paternal love, but the tenderness and self-sacrifice likewise of the maternal, is in the Apostle. He speaks of the parental relation, not by way of making it the foundation of just claims, but with an eye to its obligations and performances.

4. (V. 2.) It is worthy of remark that in v. 2 Paul does not say: *we were bold in Christ, to speak unto you the gospel of Christ,* but: *in God, of God;* and so throughout the entire section (see vv. 4, 8, 9, 12, 13). To obviate the objections of the Gentiles and Jews, he purposely reverts to the ultimate ground, still common more or less to them and Christians. Against Jesus Christ, that historical Person, they might bring forward the same exceptions as against the Apostle himself; but God is His own immediate witness in the consciences of all men. And this Divine witness of conscience was, and is, on the side of the gospel of Jesus Christ (2 Cor. iv. 2; v. 11). To this we too, in contending with the adversaries, must always again revert. We must connect Christ with God, Christianity with religion, that is, with the religious and moral nature of man in general, the positive and historical with the ideal (comp. John vii. 17).

5. (V. 5.) Twice in our short section does Paul *call God to witness,* vv. 5, 10, as he does in like manner also elsewhere, Rom. i. 9; Phil. i. 8; 2 Cor. i. 23; comp. xi. 31; Rom. ix. 1; 1 Tim. ii. 7. A servant of God may often find himself in the same position, especially when meeting assaults, and where the question is about dispositions and prayers. A parallel to this is presented by the *Verily, I say unto you,* which is found so frequently in the mouth of the Lord, in the Synoptists with a single, in John with a double, ἀμήν. It was necessary for Him, in opposition to the unbelief or dulness of His hearers, to corroborate the often very paradoxical truth which he had to advance. Such assertions and protestations are approaches to the *oath,* to which some of them come quite close, particularly 2 Cor. i. 2, 3, and therefore contributions to the Scriptural view of the doctrine of the oath, and to the correct interpretation and application of Matt. v. 33-37; James v. 12.

6. (V. 9.) Paul insists strongly on the right of ministers *to live of the gospel* (1 Cor. ix. 7 sqq.; 1 Tim. v. 17, 18; Gal. vi. 6), and he himself also receives support from the Philippians and other churches (2 Cor. xi. 8 sq.; Phil. iv. 10 sqq.). But in Corinth (1 Cor. ix. 12; 2 Cor. xi. 7 sqq.) and Thessalonica and apparently in Ephesus also (Acts xx. 33-35) he accepted nothing during his work there, but provided for his own maintenance partly by manual labor (Acts xviii. 3; xx. 34), partly through the gifts of other Churches (2 Cor. xi. 9; Phil. iv. 16). He did this, that he might offer no hindrance to the gospel (1 Cor. ix. 12); at Corinth, in consideration of the false Apostles (2 Cor. xi. 12 sqq.); at Thessalonica, in consideration probably of the unbelievers, whose calumnies he forsaw, or was already even in some measure aware of. For that the Thessalonian Christians were poor, as CHRYSOSTOM and others suppose, there is nothing to indicate; indeed, according to Acts xvii. 4, there were at any rate not a few rich persons among them. At the same time the Apostle desired also in his own person to furnish an example of fidelity in a earthly calling, of strenuous labor, of devoted love (Acts xx. 35; 2 Thess. iii. 7 sqq.). We have now here before us one of the cases in which, as in so many outward things—for example, in regard to usages, the times and places of Divine service, &c.—it could not be but that changes, to wit, specific regulations, should gradually be forthcoming in the Church. Soon the clerical calling could no longer be united with a secular one. It had therefore to be furnished with a regular income, and this is in accordance with Paul's doctrine. If then, we neither can nor should directly imitate his practice herein; if indeed, speaking generally, the exemplariness of the Lord and His Apostles does not require from us a direct, outward imitation—this were really to turn the gospel again into law and letter (comp. ch. i. 6, 7, Doctrinal and Ethical, Note 5),—it is only the more important that we enter into the meaning and spirit of the Apostle, and act on this Apostolic view of the matter. Not to the Pope alone does his worldly dominion prove to be ruin; among us also earthly good has already become the curse and snare of many clergymen. This is one of the tenderest points in the relation between the shepherd and the flock, and by it is often insensibly closed the mouth of the shepherd and the heart of the sheep. There are certain portions of income, those that partake more of the nature of perquisites, which still fall immediately under the apostolic rule, not to burden those who would thereby be burdened, and rather to undergo privations, "lest we should hinder the gospel of Christ" (1 Cor. ix. 12). It deserves also to be noticed that the Apostle (1 Cor. ix. 14) says, that the Lord hath ordained that they who preach the gospel should live of the gospel, should have wherewithal to live, and not more. With us, to be sure, and especially of late, care is commonly taken that we should not have it in our power to think of laying up treasures. The wish expressed by Schleiermacher in 1804, "that the relations of the preacher's position should be put more and more on such a footing, that it could present no external attraction to those who did not value it for its own sake," has already received a manifold fulfilment. Those, however, who have to struggle with want and privation, may seek and find a strong consolation in the fact, that they thus stand nearer to the apostolic model, than if they lived in abundance of everything. Comp. the flaming words of LUDWIG HOFACKER in his Life by A. KNAPP, 1852, p. 157 sq.: "Often enough have I been offended with a certain class of ministers. To lament over their poor pay is the

whole business, their main topic of conversation. Nowhere is there less of faith and contentment than among men of this sort. With them the earthly mind thoroughly predominates. In no class is there less of Divine understanding. In heaven we shall probably meet the smallest proportion of ministers; for it is well-nigh impossible that such an ease-loving, selfish minister should enter the kingdom of heaven. Is it not a real mercy that we are even kept a little short? How much money, then, must a preacher have on hand? Or how much must he have in furniture and pictures? On this absurdity I could descant for a day, and not exhaust the topic, dealing not with individual cases, but with the thing itself, nor yet out of illiberality of feeling, but from long observation. Ah, where is the imitation of Christ's life of poverty? No doubt, there are many who suffer, but why? because they fancy that a son is not saved, unless he gets to be a gentleman at the University. The true sufferers are they who are silent and endure, looking up to God."

[M. HENRY: There is no general rule to be drawn from this instance; either that ministers may at *no time* work with their hands for supply of their outward necessities, or that they ought *always* to do so.—J. L.]

7. (V. 11.) Paul emphasizes the fact that he had *exhorted every single individual*. Comp. Acts xx. 31, and especially the thrice repeated *πάντα ἄνθρωπον* of Col. i. 28. Here, as in Rom. v. 12, 15, 18 sq.; 1 Tim. ii. 4 sqq., the emphasis is on *ἄνθρωπος*, since Paul is speaking of the spread of the Gospel among the Gentiles, of the removal of the distinction between Jews and Gentiles, of Jesus belonging as man to all mankind, and of every individual simply as a man having an interest in Him. This is that idea of humanity, of the infinite value of each individual human soul before God, which first came to light in the New Covenant, in Christianity, and of which the Gentile Apostle was preeminently the bearer. In ancient times, to which the Old Covenant still essentially belongs, mankind was as yet given up as fleshly to the forces of nature, and therefore also to national divisions. The opposition of עַם and גּוֹיִם, *λαός* and *ἔθνη* stood in force, as that of Greeks and Barbarians; for God in His revelation condescended to the *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*. Not yet was the individual of any consequence in himself as a man; he came into view merely as a member of the larger natural whole, the people. A relative advance in this respect is certainly not to be mistaken within the sphere of the old world, when, for example, we think in the Old Testament of the Psalms, in Greece of the schools of philosophy, in Rome of the domestic life of a Cato and others. But even the Psalmist, who knows that in covenant with his God he is strong and secure against all the world, is ever an Israelite; the Grecian sage is always a Hellene; and so forth. First on the cross of Christ was the flesh and the whole power of nature broken in pieces; first in Christ was the one new *man* created, so that now there is no longer a question of Jew, Greek, Barbarian, Scythian (Eph. ii. 15; Col. iii. 11); there was born the idea at once of humanity and of man; universalism, and along with that the true subjectivity and individualism, for every one singly to lay hold in faith freely from within on the salvation of God, and so attain to the fulness of human dignity (as was already represented in the call of Abraham, Rom. iv.; Gal. iii.). Not only did Paul recognize and preach this great truth; he likewise at the same time made practical application of it, on the universal side in his Gentile mission, on the other in his special care of souls. The nationalists, therefore, have lost, not their significance, but merely the sting of mutual antipathy, so far as their members are in Christ; in the future kingdom of Christ the curse, the covering, will be removed from the nations as such, as from individuals at present, so that the whole life of history shall be a regenerate life, a life from the dead (Rom. xi. 15: comp. Is. xxv. 7, 8).

8. (V. 12.) *Glory* (*δόξα*, כָּבוֹד; for this Luther has also sometimes *Klarheit* [*clearness, lustre*], as for *δοξάζειν verklären* [*to illustrate*]) is a radical term used in Scripture of God, which in theosophy has met with more consideration than in theology. It is the real, organic side in the conception of spirit, whereby the Absolute Personality is not a mere abstract *Ego*, but the Absolute Life, unfolding and shaping itself in a fulness (*πλήρωμα*) of powers. What in earthly phrase has been called nature or the corporeity of God finds in the word *glory*—with which stand connected the expressions *majesty*, *beauty*, *light*, &c., when used of God—its Scriptural foundation and limitation. In glory is found the reason why the whole man, even as to his body, is called the image of God. By means of glory also is brought about, agreeably to its idea, the appearance or revelation of God. Christ's glorification consists essentially in this, that His human nature is raised into the condition of this Divine glory. He makes a real, inward communication of it to His own (*unio mystica*, the sacraments), so that they become partakers of the Divine nature (2 Pet. i. 4; John xiv. 23; xvii. 5, 22, 24), till in the resurrection they are manifested in this glory, even as to their body (Col. iii. 3, 4). BENGEL (on Acts vii. 2) calls glory *divinitas conspicua;* OETINGER, the unveiled holiness,—the great word that sums up the whole New Testament: J. T. BECK, *christliche Lehrwissenchaft*, p. 67, the self-manifestation of the living image of God, which has for man a hidden side, but also one visible in rich forms and degrees, and for special revelations assumes special local shapes.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vv. 1-12.—This section and its several parts are especially appropriate for texts of inaugural and ordination sermons, and such like; happy he, who can take from it also his farewell text! The principal thought of the two main divisions, vv. 1-9 and 10-12, are embraced in the Doctrinal and Ethical department, No. 2, and there already arranged also with reference to the Homiletic use.—J. MICH. HAHN: Our Epistle was written to such as had been awakened for about half a year; it is thus rather for such as are weaker and for beginners. For this reason Paul strengthens and animates the Thessalonians by very circumstantial arguments from his own behavior, and that of Silas, among them; considering that with inexperienced souls one must deal more largely in details, than with those who are more spiritually developed.—THE SAME: That is it which in our days makes faith so difficult: sinful men dare to call in question the word of God, and to correct it, saying quite plainly that to a great extent it is just the word of man. This mischievous cavilling may in dark hours of temptation rack with doubts even the lovers of truth, and frequently, if

they have thoughtful souls, they undergo no light struggle. But these doubts are by the lover of truth overcome, and tend to the strengthening and confirmation of faith; for as all things must work together for good to those who love God and truth, so likewise this, since it too belongs to the "all."—DIEDRICH: For the Christian it is important frequently to review his previous guidance in Christ, that he may become ever more conscious of the work of the Lord, and also feel himself bound in hearty affection to those, through whom the Lord has come to us. To the calumniators of the Apostle we owe thanks to this day, for having been to him the occasion for such an exact self-portraiture. The enemies of the truth know not at all, what good service they often render to it.

Vv. 1, 2. J. MICH. HAHN: The great boldness after the contumelious suffering is a sound, valid proof of the truth of God's word, and of faith's real ground. How should human nature be able to act and suffer thus aimlessly? Its wont truly is, to seek and intend self in everything.—THE SAME: The Lord's true messengers are for the most part prepared in the school of suffering, and not in the society of trifling, young people, who in their frivolity often do not know what to go at. If one or another from that quarter is to prosper, he too is called out of the confusion into the school of the cross, like all the rest.—THE SAME: While the Spirit of glory rested on us (1 Pet. iv. 14), we had spiritual boldness, joy in God and with God, incomparable heart-joy; for the life of the spirit was so predominant, that we regarded nothing in nature.—RIEGER: Suffering does not weaken faith, and so it does not even abate boldness in opening the mouth. Suffering, indeed, undergone lovingly and willingly, assures a man that he is renewed into the image of Christ, and is treading in the footsteps wherein have walked all the lovers of truth, who in the world have been reviled. Suffering makes good salt; avoidance of the cross makes the salt insipid.—THE SAME: When we hear of the boldness of the Apostles, we often suppose that all fear had been blown away. But the Apostles themselves commonly put the two things together; on the one side, what through grace obtained the victory, namely boldness, and, on the other side, those assaults from nature and from the aspect of the world, through which they had to fight their way with great contention.—ZWINGLI: The preaching of the gospel does not go forward without a struggle, and indeed many struggles; for Christ is the sign that is spoken against.

[BURKITT: The Apostle calls his boldness a boldness *in God*, because a boldness for God and from God.—ALFORD: All true confidence is in God as *our God*.—M. HENRY: Suffering in a good cause should rather sharpen than blunt the edge of holy resolution.—J. L.]

Vv. 3, 4. RIEGER: It is still at present an easy thing for the world, when the gospel is propounded, to give it sometimes the appearance of error, superstition, peculiar notions; and in other cases, where some concession must be made to any one, to impute to him impure aims and self-seeking.—THE SAME: In preaching the gospel, much depends on the heart and its purity tried and approved by God; only in a good conscience can the mystery of the faith be put. Not merely in the beginning and on our first reception into His service does God prove our heart, but daily and hourly.—CALVIN: To please God and to please men are brought together by Paul as things mutually opposed.—RIEGER: In striving to please, not men, but God, the gate is strait, and the way narrow. One should, of course, commend himself to the consciences of men—should so deal with them, that, without his pleasing them after the flesh, they shall yet think favorably of him, and not in distrust turn away their heart and ear—should show to every man all gentleness, condescension, and readiness to oblige, and yet so keep himself apart in the spirit of the cross, as to be intent on pleasing, not men, but God (1 Cor. x. 33).—DIEDRICH: We may well trust those, who, in their transactions with us, desire in everything only to please God; God certainly desires what is best for us. Such as would merely please *us* will at the least, and without their knowing it, be unfaithful to us.—RIEGER: Precious operation of the Spirit of glory, who rests on the sufferers, and, in their deepest submersion in the baptism of sorrow, instructs them still to keep their head up, and to say to their God: For he knoweth the secrets of the heart (Ps. xliv. 22).*

Vv. 5–7. RIEGER: We cannot do too much for the sake of winning men's souls; and, if the world calls that flattery, we are to regard it as little as Jesus left off eating and drinking with publicans and sinners on account of the Pharisees. When, indeed, one's aim with men is to steal some advantage for one's self or one's friends, and lull others to sleep to their own soul's hurt, in that case there may be danger of indulging in words of flattery: and therefore the Apostle immediately disclaims covetousness also.—CALVIN: Where avarice and ambition rule, there follow innumerable corruptions, and the whole man sinks into vanity; for these are the two fountains, whence flows the corruption of the entire ministry.—CHRYSOSTOM: Paul says not: We were dishonored, nor yet: We received no honor;—that were to have reproached the Thessalonians;—but: We sought it not. [ŒCUMENIUS extends the emphasis to *ἐξ ἀνθρώπων*: "for the glory that is from God they both sought and received: *τὴν γὰρ ἐκ θεοῦ καὶ ἐζήτουν καὶ ἐλάμβανον*.—J. L.] J. M. HAHN: Although as ambassadors of the sovereign Lord of the whole creation we might have used authority, yet we did not seek to extort from you any such regard as that you should look upon us with fear and awe. This is the way nowadays of those who presume on their office. But what credit have they with the people, and what hearts trust them? That is the very reason why they are universally abandoned. Not so the Lord's ambassadors!—RIEGER: Therein consists a great secret of the kingdom of Christ, that by means of love, whereby the greatest becomes as the servant of all, He effects more, maintains a more fruitful order, than is achieved in any worldly empire by ever so rigorous a distinction of ranks.—THE SAME: Christians, it is true, are not an abject people; they deal in large aims and hopes. They do not, however, seek honor from men, nor in the present time, but take it on credit against the resurrection of the just.

[BURKITT: Flattery in any is odious, in a minister 'tis monstrous, both because spiritual men ought to be most plain-hearted, and also because flattery about spiritual things is most fatal and pernicious, both to the giver and receivers.—A. CLARKE: They

* [Ps. xliv. 21 of the English version. Luther's version, followed in our text: *nun kennet er ja unsers Herzens Grund*.—J. L.]

that preach the gospel should *live* (not *riot*) by the gospel. But woe to that man who entered into the *labor* for the sake of the *hire;* he knows not Christ and how can he preach Him?—J. L.]

Vv. 7–9. The Apostle's motherly love to those committed to his care, as shown 1. in the most intimate heart-communications to them, 2. in tender affability, 3. in indefatigable self-sacrifice.—The connection of official fidelity with personal love.—New-born children often cry a great deal, get sick easily, give also every kind of annoyance, and need much care, and only a mother's love and a mother's patience can bear with them (Büchsel: *Erinnerungen aus dem Leben eines Landgeistlichen*, *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, 1859).—Roos: Dost thou from hearty love undergo day and night toil and trouble, which no man imposes on thee, or repays?—Calvin: Paul's unwillingness to have his wants supplied was in order that he might not hinder the gospel. For good pastors must be careful, not merely to run strenuously in their ministry, but of this also, that, so far as is in their power, they remove all obstacles from their course.—Rieger: Ministers of the gospel never want occasion to practise many an economy in housekeeping, in the education of children, in clothes and comforts; whereby in some cases one has rather wherewithal to give to the needy, and in other cases our income suffices, nor is there any need to trouble ourselves and others with so many complaints, or with so much striving after changes. And again, there is always reason why we should not set so high a value on what we are compelled to add from our own means, but reflect whether it is quite as much, as when Paul along with his preaching labored as a handicraftsman.—Paul made no claims on this life—desired not to have things easy in the present world; and therefore also the world could do him no harm.—J. G. Kolb: He who has the Spirit of Christ is faithful also in his earthly calling. That is, he is not too lazy to apply his powers in that direction; and neither does he do too much, so as to waste his strength in vanity. He gives his time to securing the heavenly calling in the midst of the earthly one. Such a man is then so much more effective in the kingdom of God.

[V. 10. Webster and Wilkinson: Only believers can rightly estimate holiness and righteousness; and it betokens high attainments in religion to be considered, and to be, an example of holiness and righteousness to them.—J. L.]

Vv. 10–12. Rieger: He who in Divine things seeks not his own, but serves the will of God, acts holily; he who does no wrong to his neighbor in anything, but shows him all love, acts righteously; and he who, moreover, in his behavior, speech and entire conduct, puts it in no man's power to charge him with an offensive contrast between his teaching and his life, acts unblamably. A father has and exerts an authority, but it is that of love, not of law.—Spener says in one of his farewell discourses: I cannot say that I am pure from the blood of all men; for I cannot say that I have not ceased to warn every one.—Paul a model, not merely in preaching, but also in the care of souls, and in the union of the two. The great Apostle, who filled the whole world with the sound of the gospel, at the same time went after individual souls with all zeal. The different ways in which salvation must be brought near to different men, and even to the same men at different times. We must learn to vary our voice.—[M. Henry: We should not only be good as to our *general* calling as Christians, but in our *particular* callings and relations.—J. L.]

[V. 12. Bp. Davenant, on Col. i. 10: By this form of speaking we are admonished, that Christianity consists in a perpetual journey towards the celestial country, and that no one must halt by the way.—Webster and Wilkinson: The kingdom is glorious, and the glory kingly.—J. L.]

Ch. II. 13–16.

3. b. The Apostle now on his part also reminds the Thessalonians, with thanksgiving to God, that they had received his word as the word of God, as they have since continually experienced in themselves God's mighty working (v. 13). They could not otherwise have endured such vexations from their countrymen, as the brethren in Judea had from the Jews (v. 14), whose enmity to the truth and the Apostles, moreover, need give the less offence, that they are thereby rather only filling the measure of their sins, and ripening rapidly for judgment (vv. 15, 16).

13 For this cause[1] also thank we [we also give thanks to][2] God without ceasing,
because, when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us [received
from us the word of preaching *that is* of God],[3] ye received *it* not *as* the word
of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God [ye accepted, not men's word,
but, as it is in truth, God's word],[4] which effectually worketh also [also work-
14 eth][5] in you that believe. For ye, brethren, became followers [imitators, *μιμηταί*]
of the churches of God which in Judea are [which are in Judea, *τῶν οὐσῶν ἐν τῇ
Ἰουδαίᾳ*] in Christ Jesus; for ye also have suffered [suffered, *ἐπάθετε*] like things
[the same things, *τὰ αὐτά*][6] of your own countrymen, even as they *have* of the
15 Jews; who both killed the Lord [also killed the Lord][7] Jesus and their own
prophets,[8] and have persecuted [and persecuted, *ἐκδιωξάντων*] us,[9] and they please
16 not God, and are contrary to all men, forbidding us to speak [hindering us
from speaking, *κωλυόντων . . . . λαλῆσαι*] to the Gentiles, that they might [may]

be saved, to fill up their sins always: for [but, δέ] the wrath[10] is come [came][11] upon them to the uttermost [to the end, εἰς τέλος].

[1] V. 13.—Καί is read before διὰ τοῦτο [as well as after it] by Lachmann, Tischendorf, [Alford,] after A. B. [Sin.]; but the authority is insufficient (Lünemann).

[2] V. 13.—[καὶ ἡμεῖς εὐχαριστοῦμεν. The καί belongs, as usual, to what immediately follows it.—E. V. renders εὐχαριστέω by *to give thanks* in ch. i. 2; v. 18; 2 Thess. ii. 13, and 23 times elsewhere out of 34.—J. L.]

[3] V. 13.—[The above is Ellicott's version of παραλαβόντες λόγον ἀκοῆς παρ' ἡμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ. Auberlen; *da ihr das Wort der Botschaft Gottes von uns empfinget.* Alford retains the construction of the common English Version. See Exegetical Note 2.—J. L.]

[4] V. 13.—[ἐδέξασθε οὐ λόγον ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ . . . λόγον θεοῦ. Lünemann: "The addition of a ὡς (οὐχ ὡς λόγον ἀνθρ. ἀλλὰ . . . ὡς λόγον θεοῦ), in itself superfluous (see Kühner II. p. 226), was so much the more inadmissible, because the Apostle wished to express, not merely what the preached word was in the *view* of the Thessalonians, but at the same time what it was *in fact*. Hence also the emphatic parenthesis, καθώς ἐστιν ἀληθῶς." To the same effect many others, including Alford, Wordsworth, and Ellicott.—In the Cod. Sin. ἀληθῶς, omitted *a prima manu*, is supplied by correction.—J. L.]

[5] V. 13—[καὶ ἐνεργεῖται. The *effectually* of E. V., probably from Calvin's *efficaciter*—Bishops' Bible: *effectuously*—is scarcely warranted; though neither is our simple *worketh* quite satisfactory. Auberlen: *sich wirksam beweist* = *shows itself operative*; and so many others.—J. L.]

[6] V. 14.—[So Sin. B. D. E. F. &c., and the critical editors, instead of ταὐτά (Rec., after A. &c.).—J. L.]

[7] V. 15.—[If the first καί of this verse is rendered *both*, it must belong to τὸν κύριον, as in Wiclif: *which slowen bothe the lord Ihesus and the profetis;* and so others, including Conybeare, Ellicott, Vaughan. But see the Exegetical Notes, 8.—J. L.]

[8] V. 15.—Ἰδίους before προφήτας is wanting in A. B. D[1]. E[1]. J. G. [Sin.] &c., and is therefore cancelled by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf [and nearly all the other recent editors], but defended by Schott, De Wette, Reiche, &c. Even if spurious, it is at any rate an intelligent gloss. [*Revision:* "Tertullian asserts (*Adv. Marc.* V. 15.) that it was heretically introduced (*adjectio hæretici*). De Wette, on the other hand, thinks that it may have been dropped either in consequence of the ὁμοιοτέλευτον (τοὺς ἰδίους), or as offensive to the anti-gnostic spirit, and commends Schott for retaining it."]

[9] V. 15.—[Or, as in the English margin: *chased us out*, ἡμᾶς ἐκδιωξάντων. Auberlen: *uns vertrieben haben*; Ellicott, Alford: *drove us out;* Am. Bible Union: *drove us forth;* &c.—J. L.]

[10] V. 16.—[The MSS. D. E. F. G. have the Vulgate addition of τοῦ Θεοῦ after ἡ ὀργή.—J. L.]

[11] V. 16.—[ἔφθασε (Lachmann: ἔφθακε, after B. D.).—The historical time is determined by that of ἀναπληρῶσαι. Comp. the Greek of Matt. xii. 28, and see the note in *Revision.* Wordsworth, Webster and Wilkinson, Alford, and the Am. Bible Union: *came.*—J. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. (V. 13.) **For this cause we also give thanks**—Διὰ τοῦτο: Because it is God who calls you to His kingdom, *therefore* we thank Him that ye received our word, not as man's word, but God's.*—Καὶ ἡμεῖς stands opposed to αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἴδατε (v. i.)† and means Paul and his attendants, who now, in further explanation of ch. i. 6 and πῶς ἐπεστρέψατε of ch. i. 9 sq., remind the Thessalonians of their lively reception of the word of God, just as the Thessalonians were appealed to, vv. 1–12, as witnesses of the pure and powerful ministry of the Apostle among them; see on chap. i. 8, Exeg. Note 1. We have mutually received from one another the deepest impressions of an operation of the Divine Spirit: that is the third argument, adduced in ch. ii. 1–16, whereby Paul seeks to convince the Thessalonians of the reality of their faith. So deep an impression did he retain of the faith of the Thessalonians, with which they received his word as the word of God, that he has ever since felt himself moved to unceasing *thanksgiving to God.* If he speaks of the matter to God, and here repeatedly emphasizes this fact (comp. ch. i. 2), they may at once herein recognize a new indication, how little the question is about something merely human (comp. on διὰ τοῦτο). So far τῷ θεῷ answers both to the previous τοῦ θεοῦ (v. 12) and to the subsequent λόγον θεοῦ. The discourse thus turns back here, at the end of the entire section, to the beginning (ch. i. 2. EWALD).

* [The same explanation of διὰ τοῦτο is given by OLSHAUSEN, LÜNEMANN, ALFORD. Others prefer a reference to "the *general* subjects of the preceding verses,—the earnestness and zeal of the Apostle and his associates" (ELLICOTT; and similarly WEBSTER and WILKINSON). Less probable is VAUGHAN's reference to what follows.—J. L.]

† [Perhaps rather to ὑμεῖς of v. 10: *Ye* are our witnesses, and now we too are yours. Or as ZANCHIUS: Not you alone ought to give thanks for this calling, but we also. And similarly ELLICOTT. Either explanation is better than LÜNEMANN's: We, as well as every true Christian that hears of your deportment; or ALFORD's reference to those expressly mentioned in ch. i. 7.—J. L.]

2. **When ye received from us the word of preaching that is of God.**—Παραλαβ., the objective, outward, matter-of-fact reception, in distinction from δέχεσθαι, the subjective, inward acceptance (comp. ch. i. 6.)*—ἀκοή = שְׁמֻעָה, Is. liii. 1; Rom. x. 14–17 = *pass.* what one hears, a report, announcement, preaching, message. Λόγος ἀκοῆς (comp. Heb. iv. 2) is one of those genitival connections, which we in German are accustomed to express by a combination of nouns: *Botschaftswort;* EWALD: *Predigtwort* [as if we should say in English, *message-word, preaching-word*]. The addition of ἀκοῆς marks the audible, oral announcement, coming to men as a (new, hitherto unknown) message: comp. Rom. x. 17, where ἀκοή is distinguished from ῥῆμα θεοῦ, the latter going forth from God to His messengers, the former from the messengers to the rest of men. The anarthrous λόγος ἀκοῆς should perhaps be translated *a message*, to indicate it as unknown, new; comp. λόγος κυρίου of ch. iv. 15 with ὁ λόγος τοῦ K. of ch. i. 8. With this message Paul appeared among the Thessalonians; he knew that it was from God; they could not yet of themselves know that. This he here represents to us in a measure by the purposely anomalous arrangement, παρ' ἡμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ: they received the word of the message immediately from him, but behind him stood God as the Author and Sender of the message. Παρ' ἡμῶν naturally depends on παραλαβ., to which also the preposition expressly points back (DE WETTE, KOCH [ELLICOTT, WEBSTER and WILKINSON], &c.), [not on λόγος ἀκοῆς (BEZA, PELT, OLSHAUSEN, LÜNEMANN, &c.), whereby the construction becomes very harsh and clumsy withal, since τοῦ θεοῦ would have to be a closer definition of the composite idea, λόγος ἀκοῆς παρ' ἡμῶν.—RIGGENBACH.]; τοῦ θεοῦ, on the other hand, depends on λόγος ἀκοῆς, and is a *gen. autoris*, as in

* [German versions represent the two verbs by *empfangen* and *auf-* or *an-nehmen*. For ἐδέξασθε CALVIN has *amplexi estis* = *ye embraced* of BENSON, MACKNIGHT, and other English versions.—WORDSWORTH, WEBSTER and WILKINSON: *accepted.*—J. L.]

εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ of vv. 2, 8, 9, ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου of ch. i. 8, (see there Note 4). It comes last with emphasis, the point in the subsequent context being that the preaching was the word, not merely of the man Paul, but of God. Thus the participial clause, παραλαβόντες—παρ' ἡμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ, takes in once more the contents of vv. 1–12; for there, from the beginning to the end (see especially vv. 2, 4, 12), it is shown that Paul had not labored among the Thessalonians in his own name or in an egotistic manner, but, as an agent of God, had brought them His message and call.

3. **Ye accepted it, not as men's word, &c.** [**Ye accepted, not men's word, &c.**].*—The Thessalonians, then, understood and acknowledged the real nature, the Divine character and origin, of the apostolic preaching. They perceived in the word such a supernatural, essential power, as can proceed from no mortal man, himself involved in the disorder of the world's sin. They felt the Godhead drawing near to them in the word of life; for the Holy Spirit was thereby active in their souls. And as the inward sense and instinct of the Divine light in the consciousness opened to, and allowed itself to be intimately pervaded by, the concurrent light in the word, mightily judging and irradiating their previous darkness (2 Cor. iv. 4–6; John iii. 19–21), they therefore accepted the preached word for what it is, as the word of God.—Ἐδέξασθε, comp. δεξάμενοι ch. i. 6—a text for general comparison. As immediate object, λόγον ἀκοῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ must be supplied out of the participial clause; οὐ λόγον ἀνθρ. &c. is a second accusative of the predicate: *to accept something as*—WINER, p. 203 sq.—Λόγον ἀνθρ. in opposition to Θεοῦ indicates the origin, and at the same time the quality, which necessarily passes over from the source to what springs therefrom (OLSHAUSEN). The plural ἀνθρώπων stands with reference to the plurality of the preachers, and also indeed generically; comp. Matt. ix. 8. WINER, p. 158. Λόγον Θεοῦ, the word which God Himself causes to be proclaimed by men, whom He by His Spirit equips as His instruments; comp. Rom. x. 17. RIEGER: An expression of God's heart concerning us.—Καθώς ἐστιν ἀληθῶς: a simple, forcible testimony to inspiration.

4. **Who [which] also worketh in you that believe.**—Ὅς can be referred either to λόγον (ŒCUMENIUS, OLSHAUSEN, LÜNEMANN, &c. [CONYBEARE, PEILE, JOWETT, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, WORDSWORTH, WEBSTER and WILKINSON, &c.]; comp. WINER, p. 231), and in favor of this it is alleged that elsewhere the active ἐνεργεῖν is used of God, and the middle ἐνεργεῖσθαι only of things (yet comp., for example, Col. i. 29; Eph. iii. 20)†; or to Θεοῦ (THEODORET, LUTHER, BENGEL, &c.), and this is preferable, because the context treats, not of an energetic operation generally, but specially of a Divine operation;‡ BENGEL: *Deus ostendens, verbum vere esse verbum Dei* (ch. iv. 8, 9; Acts xiv. 3). On the former view the meaning must be: *which also shows itself as such*, &c. [comp. Acts xx. 32].—*Καί* adds to the acceptance of the word as God's word on the side of the Thessalonians the effective, and that a continuous, confirmation of it on the side of God (ἐδέξασθε, aorist; ἐνεργεῖται, present).* From that time onward you are in real communion with God, who shows Himself operative in you by the power of His heavenly Spirit, overruling everything human, as may be seen in the fact that even the strongest human ties cannot bind you, since you have suffered severely from your own relations and countrymen (v. 14). Τοῖς πιστεύουσιν: so far is faith from being some empty thing, that it is rather the organ for God's operations in us (comp. v. 10 and Exeg. Note 26; for the topics, Eph. i. 19).†

5. (V. 14.) **For ye, brethren, became imitators, &c.**—On γάρ, see Note 4. ὑμεῖς resumes the immediately preceding ἐν ὑμῖν, v. 23, and stands with honorable distinction foremost. Μιμηταὶ ἐγενήθητε, as in ch. i. 6. There the Thessalonian believers are described as followers of the Apostle and of the Lord Himself; here, in terms of scarcely less honor and encouragement, as followers of the original Christian churches in Judea. The Apostle points out historically a fundamental law of the kingdom of God, that is now fulfilling itself in the case of the Thessalonians: The bearers of the Divine are always expelled by the natural community to which they belong (comp. Matt. x. 35–37). Thus the Thessalonian Christians by their associates of their own race, and the Jewish Christians by the Jews, who in like manner killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and now also have driven out the Apostle. So little need the Thessalonians allow themselves to be disconcerted by the injustice done them by their compatriots, that herein rather lies the evidence of the reality and power of the Divine influences present with them; for only that which is really Divine is hated by the world (comp. the forcible word of Jesus, John vii. 7; xv. 18 sq.), just as the strength to endure this enmity likewise rests on God's operation in believers. Ἐπάθετε denotes strictly nothing more than the actual experience (*there has befallen you*), but according to the connection it includes the inward endurance of what has happened. For in no other way can πάσχειν serve to establish the efficiency of the Divine word in them, and in no other way, especially, can the preterite ἐπάθετε, which, being parallel to the ἐδέξασθε of v. 13, has primary reference to the time of their conversion, serve to confirm the present ἐνεργεῖται, than as implying that the Thessalonians have really encountered the enmity of their fellow-countrymen, and do not allow themselves to be thereby driven into apostasy. Taken together, vv. 13 and 14 thus answer pretty closely to the parallel statement in ch. i. 6; v. 13 to δεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον μετὰ χαρᾶς πνεύματος ἁγίου, v. 14 to ἐν θλίψει πολλῇ; comp. there Exeg. Note 14.

6. (V. 14.) **Of the churches of God which are in Judea, &c.**—Τοῦ Θεοῦ answers to the threefold mention of God in v. 13; τῶν οὐσῶν has ἐν twice connected with it: in the first instance, ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ, it denotes the external, geographical sphere; in the other, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, the inner, essential life-sphere, on which see ch. i. 1, Exeg. Note 3, and Doct. and Eth. 1. By the latter specification the Jewish-Christian congregations are distinguished

* [See Critical Note 4.—J. L.]

† [These two texts, in which the middle participle is connected, not with θεός, but with (the Divine) ἐνεργεία or δύναμις, cannot properly be regarded as exceptional.—J. L.]

‡ [It may quite as well be said, that in the context "the writer is *magnifying the word*, by way of justifying his continual thanksgiving to God for the Thessalonian reception of it" (*Revision*).—J. L.]

* [*Καί* is no less intelligible on the other view: "As it is God's word, so *also*, and in a manner that befits and proclaims its great Original, it worketh, &c. (*Revision*). ELLICOTT adds, that perhaps it suggests also "a contrast with the inoperative nature of the word, when merely heard and not believed."—J. L.]

† [In the preface Dr. RIGGENBACH intimates his dissent from his colleague's reference of the ὅς.—J. L.]

from the Jewish, which also εἶναι δοκοῦσι congregations of God (Œcumenius).—Τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν is also to be noted in this respect, that the Thessalonians were the first church out of Palestine that was persecuted as a church.

7. **Countrymen.**—Συμφυλ., those of the same tribe, exhibits the natural connection (Luther only too strongly: *blood relations*), and the epithet ἰδίων gives it additional force, in order the more clearly to show the gospel's penetrating, overcoming power as supernatural, Divine. By the συμφυλέται, therefore, as the contrast τῶν 'Ιουδαίων shows, are meant chiefly [only] Gentiles (Olshausen, De Wette, Lünemann, Ewald, [Alford, Ellicott, &c.] &c.), because the Thessalonian church was composed almost entirely of Gentile Christians (Acts xvii. 4). [Not Jews (Chrysostom, &c.): Calvin, Bengel, &c., think of Jews and Gentiles both.—Riggenbach.]—Αὐτοί are the members of the churches in Judea; *constructio ad sensum.*

8. (v. 15.) **Who also,** &c.—Καί is not perhaps to be connected with the καί following = *as well—as also*, since several καί follow one another in simple series: it rather adds to what precedes something new and correspondent: The Jews have not only persecuted the Christian churches in Judea, but *also* killed the Lord Jesus, &c. The subsequent strong expressions respecting the Jews are at first sight somewhat strange, indeed almost displeasing, especially because one does not well see, at least not at once, how the Apostle was led to them by the context. Looked at more closely, they fall apart into two divisions, the first consisting of past participles (ἀποκτεινάντων, ἐκδιωξάντων), the second of present (ἀρεσκόντων with ἐναντίων, κωλυόντων). Both divisions end in something that has reference to the Apostle: ἡμᾶς ἐκδιωξ., v. 15, κωλυόντων ἡμᾶς, v. 16. Thus, the point in question is the relation of the Jews to the Apostle, on which comp. Acts xvii. 5. This seems also to have been used against the Apostle by the countrymen of the Thessalonians. They might say: "How can you still believe that stranger? His own people, in fact, have driven him out, and are utterly unwilling to have him draw you over to his side;"—an objection which might have the more weight for the Thessalonian Christians, because most of them had previously been proselytes (Acts xvii. 4), and so accustomed to seek and find the truth among the Jews. To this Paul now answers: "Yes, they have persecuted me, but no otherwise than they did the Lord Jesus and their own prophets; nor are they willing to endure it, that I should publish salvation to you, and the Gentiles generally; but in this they are merely contrary to God and men, and fill up the measure of their sins." Thus regarded, vv. 15 and 16 have a meaning and significance in where they stand, and thus also is set aside the offensive harshness that seems to lie in the words; it is set aside from the same point of view, which in the earlier sections removes the offence of self-praise or of the praise of the Thessalonians. But the treatment of this matter is attached to this particular context for the reason that it falls under the same law as the suffering of the Thessalonians from those of their own race (see Exeg. Note 5): Paul had the same experience from his countrymen, as they from theirs; and as they were preceded by the Jewish Christians, so he himself by the Lord and the prophets. With such predecessors, and with this uniformity of experience, the offence must surely cease. It is moreover evident that the example in v. 14 is there selected with an eye to the fact, that Paul means presently to speak of the Jews. And this point he has kept to the close of the entire section; for having fully reestablished his own authority with his readers, he can the more powerfully subvert their earlier authority, the Jews. [While expositors generally deal with the difficulty, some of the expedients adopted by them in accounting for vv. 15 and 16 are very farfetched. Olshausen: "Paul foresaw that the Judaizers, standing on the same level as the Jews, would damage him in this Church also, and therefore, by way of precaution, he here expressed himself on the points in regard to which he was usually blamed." But would any one attack the Jews beforehand, in order to resist a possible, later incursion of Judaizing Christians, to whom, besides, several things are here inapplicable, whilst their characteristic peculiarities, especially their legality, are wanting? Von Hofmann, on the contrary, supposes that some desired to persuade the Thessalonians, that the gospel was purely a Jewish affair, and that it is in opposition to this notion that Paul here speaks. But one cannot understand how this objection could arise, since the Jews were certainly the first and most vehement adversaries of the gospel in Thessalonica; and then an attack on the Jews would still have been a very indirect and extravagant way of defending himself against that objection. De Wette contents himself altogether with the remark, that the Apostle seizes the opportunity to give vent to his displeasure with the Jews. Lünemann is correct in finding the occasion of the philippic, vv. 15 and 16, in the fact, that in Thessalonica the Jews were the real instigators of the persecutions of the Christians, and that in other places likewise they manifested the same obdurate spirit of contradiction; but with this generality he stops, and so fails to account for the complexion of the entire passage, as well as its particular phrases, and overlooks the reference to Paul. Calvin, who is followed by Calixtus, comes nearest the truth: *Poterat Thessalonicensibus hoc venire in mentem: si hæc vera est religio, cur eam tam infestis animis oppugnant Judæi, qui sunt sacer Dei populus? Ut hoc offendiculam tollat, primum admonet, hoc eos commune habere cum primis ecclesiis, quæ in Judæa erant, postea Judæos dicit obstinatos esse Dei omnis sanæ doctrinæ hostes.* The only mistake here is, that Calvin, whilst he too overlooks the special reference of vv. 15, 16 to Paul, and understands συμφυλετ., v. 14, principally of the Jews, brings to bear on v. 14 the point of view, that is applicable to v. 15 sq.—Riggenbach.]

9. **The Lord Jesus and their own prophets,** &c.—Τ ὸ ν κ ύ ρ ι ο ν stands emphatically first, and is still more marked in being separated by ἀποκτειν. from 'Ιησοῦν: Yea, the Lord Himself they killed (comp. 1 Cor. ii. 8); is it to be wondered at, if they persecute the servant (comp. John xv. 20)? What is expressed in the case of 'Ιησοῦν by the prominent putting forward of τὸν κύριον is in the case of τοὺς προφήτας expressed by the addition of ἰ δ ί ο υ ς: their own prophets, ὧν καὶ τὰ τεύχη περιφέρουσι (Chrysost.), they treated no better than they have done the Gentile Apostle. This internal evidence is favorable to the genuineness of ἰδίους; if regarded as spurious, this makes no change whatever in the thought; we lose merely that particular stroke. Τοὺς προφήτας might grammatically be connected, as Koch would have it, with what follows; but com-

mentators correctly refer it to what goes before, both because in other places also mention is made of the Jewish murder of the prophets (Matt. xxiii. 31, 37; Luke xi. 47 sq.; xiii. 34; Acts vii. 52), and on account of ἐκδιωξάντων, of which presently.—When Paul now proceeds: **καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐκδιωξάντων**, we are by this time so well prepared for it, that it can no longer furnish an objection to him, but rather an argument for him and against the Jews. Ἐκδιώκειν is no doubt in the Sept. Ps. xliv. 17 [16]; cxix. 157 the strengthened διώκειν (De Wette, Lünem.); but the proper meaning of the word (see, for instance, Passow, who indeed gives no other meaning) is *to pursue forth, chase out, expel, persequendo ejicere* (Bengel, who adds: *frequens verbum apud LXX.*), and so the word stands in the only other passage where it occurs in the New Testament, Luke xi. 49 (in the parallel passage, Matt. xxiii. 34, διώξετε ἀπὸ πόλεως εἰς πόλιν)—a point of so much the more importance, as Paul probably has here in his eye that expression of Christ. In this case we are (with J. Mich. Hahn, Baur, &c.) to think simply of the expulsion of Paul and his companions from Thessalonica (see Acts xvii. 5, 13), the very thing at which many believers might stumble. [Bengel, Pelt, Schott, Lünemann, (Ellicott,) think of the persecutions of Paul and the Apostles generally; but this extension of ἡμᾶς is against the context, see vv. 16 and 17, as well as v. 13; besides, the aorist participle leads us the more readily to think of a single act, since the Jewish persecutions of the Apostles in general still continued (see Acts xvii. 13; xviii. 6, 12), so that it must have been ἐκδιωκόντων as well as afterwards κωλυόντων.—Riggenbach.]

10. **And they please not God**, &c.—The participles now pass from the aorist [Alford: *definite events*] into the present [Alford: *habits*] and, as τῶν καὶ τὸν κύριον—ἐκδιωξάντων hangs closely together, so again does all that follows as far as σωθῶσιν. For not to please God and to be contrary to all men are correlatives, and κωλυόντων, &c. adds to it nothing new and independent, but, having no καί before it like all the previous participles, is to be subordinated to ἀρεσκ. and ἐναντίων [with Lünem., though he makes it depend only on ἐναντίων (and so Alford.—J. L.).—Riggenbach.], comp. v. 6 sq.; 11 sq. The subordinate clause shows to what extent the Jews displease God, and are contrary to all men; and thus at the same time these strong expressions lose much of their harshness.—Θεῷ μὴ ἀρεσκόντων: the Jews were jealous at Thessalonica (Acts xvii. 5), as they were elsewhere both before and afterwards (ch. xiii. 45; xviii. 6–13; comp. ch. xxii. 21 sq.; xxvi. 19 [21]), because through Paul so many Gentiles were converted, and this jealousy was with them a zeal for God and His kingdom in Israel (Rom. x. 2), whereby they thought to please Him (comp. John xvi. 2). In opposition to this Paul now says; they please not God. Thus the subjective negative μή does not imply *placere non quærentium* (Bengel, &c.); but, on the contrary, it denies the ἀρέσκειν as conceived by the Jews and also by the Thessalonians (Winer, p. 428 sq.)* *Ubi dicit non placere Deo, hoc vult, indignos esse, quorum ratio inter Dei cultores habeatur* (Calvin). The very softness of the expression has a peculiar force.—Πᾶσιν ἀνθρ. ἐναντίων: as contrary to God, so contrary to men; but the former passively = *objects of the Divine displeasure*, the latter actively = *hostile to all men.* πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, of course, excepting themselves, and so, as to the sense, = τοῖς ἔθνεσιν in the explanatory clause. But Paul purposely holds up to view the inhumanity of this state of mind. When heathen writers, as interpreters are here in the habit of reminding us, reproach the Jews with *adversus omnes alios hostile odium* (Tac. *Hist.* V. 5; Juv. *Sat.* xiv. 103 sqq.; Jos. *c. Ap.* ii. 10-14, etc.), they do not at any rate properly distinguish in this thing the Divinely sanctioned particularism of Israel, and the proud, narrow-minded exclusivism of the Jews. Paul, of course, blames only the latter, which would not acknowledge that God Himself had now abolished the former.

11. (V. 16.) **Hindering us**, &c.—Κωλυόντων, see Exeg. Note 10. Λαλῆσαι ἵνα σωθῶσιν, either: *to preach to the Gentiles, in order that they may be saved*, (Bengel, Olshausen, De Wette; thus taking λαλ. as a *meiosis* or *tapeinosis* for εὐαγγελίζεσθαι); or ἵνα is weakened, as in the New Testament it so often is, and marks the object (Winer, p. 299 sqq.) = λαλῆσαι περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας, λαλῆσαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον V. 2 (Lünemann, [Ellicott, Webster and Wilkinson], &c.). The latter method is the more simple.

12. **To fill up their sins always.**—Εἰς τό, &c., belongs, not merely to κωλυόντων, but to the whole description from v. 15. The result is here presented as an unconscious purpose, just as we say: *to fill up the measure* [De Wette]. [εἰς, then, is not = ὥστε, of the result as such (Pelt, &c.); but neither does it mark God's purpose in the sins of the Jews (Olshausen, Lünemann)*: the expression belongs not so much to the Pauline style of thought, as to ordinary speech.—Riggenbach]:—αὐτῶν stands emphatically before τὰς ἁμαρτ.: *their* sins, while they are persecuting others, God's messengers, as sinners.—Ἀναπληρῶσαι, comp. Matt. xxiii. 32, καὶ ὑμεῖς πληρώσατε τὸ μέτρον τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν [also Gen. xv. 16]. The compound ἀναπληρ. means *to fill up, to fill again higher*, so that, as it were, the still empty space in the vessel becomes ever smaller. We thus get a simple explanation of πάντοτε (which is thought to be difficult by De Wette, and strange by Olshausen, who, with Bretschneider, would take it as = πάντως, παντελῶς). The subsequent clause likewise with its εἰς τέλος, will in this connection obtain its natural interpretation. Πάντοτε means *always, at every time*, by the persecution of the prophets, of the Lord, of the Apostle, the sins were always again filled up, filled higher, till now the measure is full.

13. **But the wrath came upon them to the end.**—Δέ opposes to the sin its punishment, and to the ever fresh increase the end. Parallel to the heaping up of the sin went the heaping up of the judicial wrath of God (Rom. ii. 5), which now, however, is come *to the end*, to the uttermost, where it must discharge itself (Lünemann). On ἡ ὀργή [Jowett: either the long-expected wrath, or the wrath consequent upon their sins.—J. L.] see ch. i. 10, Exeg. Note 14. Εἰς τέλος is to be connected with ἔφθασε, which means simply *pervenit* (Vul-

* [Ellicott: "It is not correct always to find in the μή (as Alford here) a reference to the feelings or views of the *subject* connected with the participle (compare on Gal. iv. 8). It sometimes refers to the *aspect* in which the facts are presented by the writer, and regarded by the reader." In this correction Alford now acquiesces.—J. L.]

* [Alford and Ellicott also agree in thinking this the main reference of εἰς τό, considered not grammatically, but theologically. Jowett: the object and the result blended together in one; the natural event, as the Apostle regards it, in the order of Providence.—J. L.]

gate, CALVIN, DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN, &c.), not *prævenit* (BEZA, SCHOTT, PELT, &c.), since in the New Testament, with the exception of 1 Thess. iv. 15, φθάνειν occurs only in the later, weakened sense of *reaching to*, with εἰς (Rom. ix. 31; Phil. iii. 16), ἐπί τινα (Matt. xii. 28; Luke xi. 20; comp. Dan. iv. 25), ἄχρι τινός (2 Cor. x. 14). Here it is connected with two prepositions of the direction, one of which (εἰς τέλος) indicates the inward development to the end; the other (ἐπ' αὐτούς), the outward movement. [At this many interpreters needlessly stumble, and have either taken εἰς τέλος adverbially (=*finally* or *totally*), or have thought it necessary to refer it to ἡ ὀργή: the wrath which lasts to the end of the world, or for ever (THEODORET, THEOPHYLACT, ŒCUMENIUS, &c.), or till its full manifestation (OLSHAUSEN),* or to the destruction of the Jews (GROTIUS, PELT, FLATT, &c.). The last view is shared also by DE WETTE, EWALD, &c., who connect εἰς τέλος with ἔφθασε in the sense of 2 Chron. xxxi. 1; Dan. ix. 27,—to utter ruin, to complete extinction. —RIGGENBACH.]—Paul knows that the Jews, having likewise rejected the Messiah and the spiritual witness of his Apostles, are now ripe for judgment, which accordingly followed soon after in the Roman destruction of Jerusalem. He neither appeals to any revelation that he had received on this subject, nor does he merely draw inferences from the political situation of the Jews [JOWETT: "To the Apostle, reading the future in the present, the state of Judea at any time during the last thirty years before the destruction of the city, would have been sufficient to justify the expression, 'wrath is come upon them to the uttermost.'"—J. L.], but in the light of prophecy of the Old Testament and of the Lord Himself (EWALD mentions Matt. xxiii. 37–39; xxiv. 16 sqq.; Dan. ix. 24 sqq.) he discerns with clear spiritual glance the interpretation of the signs of the time. With this earnest word on the near imminence of the Divine judgment on the principal adversaries of the gospel the section closes, and so again in a measure with an eschatological prospect (comp. ch. i. 10; ii. 12). While the Jews fall under wrath, Christians are saved from wrath (ch. i. 10), and called to God's kingdom and glory (ch. ii. 12).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. (V. 13.) It may seem strange that Paul should thank God for something that the Thessalonians had done (ἐδέξασθε). We are not to infer from this, that their acceptance of the word, or their *faith*, is thought of as an *operation of God* to the exclusion of *man's free receptivity*. Had Paul meant to say this, he must have expressed himself otherwise, as thus: We thank God that He wrought the acceptance, or faith, in you. But the indication in ἐδέξασθε of free receptivity is the more marked, as it is only afterward that the operation of God in them is named in confirmation of the Divine character of the freely accepted word (ὃς καὶ ἐνεργεῖται ἐν ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν).† Nevertheless, Paul can and must thank God for the faith of the Thessalonians, partly because it would not have existed but for His preparative grace, and the accompanying influence of His Spirit, whereby the Thessalonians were convinced that Paul's word was God's word, and thus faith is no independent act of man (Olshausen), but really rests on a Divine causality; partly because for every good thing that happens to the Christian, and makes him glad—and the faith of the Thessalonians was for Paul something in the highest degree exhilarating (vv. 19, 20)—he gives thanks and honor to the Father of lights, under whose providential guidance and control stand even the free actions of men (Lünemann). Comp. ch. i. 6, and its Exegetical Note 14, and Doctrinal Principles, No. 3.

2. Paul calls his word *God's word*. To what extent he knew himself to be justified in doing so has been shown already, especially in vv. 2, 4 and ch. i. 5. God Himself, by a miraculous call and the light of revelation had entrusted him with the proclamation of His glad tidings to the world (comp. Gal. i. 11–16; 1 Cor. ii. 6–16; Col. i. 25–29; Eph. iii. 1–12), and now in Thessalonica, as in Corinth and elsewhere (1 Cor. ii. 4, 5; Rom. xv. 18, 19), he has preached the gospel in the energy of the Holy Ghost. There are thus two essential points in the case: 1. The apostolic call and illumination (inspiration), which, effected by special acts of God, concerns the whole man, and assigns to him an official mission, a fundamental position and significance in the kingdom of God (comp. Eph. ii. 20); 2. the separate acts of proclamation, performed on the ground of that general inspiration, and yet again in every particular instance, "in power and in the Holy Ghost and in much assurance," or "in demonstration of the spirit and in power." Now what is true of the oral proclamation of Apostles holds good of the written. "For the relation between word and writing is ordinarily this, that the writing compresses the copiousness of the spoken word into a settled elementary form—the final expression, made clear and strong by deliberate reflection, of the inspired thought—and so in Holy Scripture we have the ripe, developed fruit of inspiration" (MARTENSEN, *Dogmatik*, 2d ed., p. 455). We are therefore at liberty, and are bound, to call also *the written word of Apostles* (and Prophets) the word of God. And down through all centuries the Church has borne to it in the power of the Spirit the same witness, that the Thessalonians did to Paul's oral proclamation; she has freely recognized and accepted it as God's word. The *testimonium Spiritus Sancti* continually asserts itself as the subjective correlative and living evidence of *inspiratio*.—But now, as regards the uninterrupted oral proclamation of the word of God in the *preaching* of the Church, on that point Paul says in the Pastoral Epistles, which may be regarded as his legacy to the Church in its gradual transition from the first age of the Apostles into the common course of history: "Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me," and: "The thing that thou hast heard of me, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also" (2 Tim. i. 13; ii. 2). He will thus have the Church's doctrine and preaching expressly bound to the fundamental apostolic word, and, though here too the reference is to what is spoken and heard, yet we properly may and ought once more to think of the written word, which, indeed, is the only authentic tradition of the oral for later generations (1 John ii. 7, 24; i. 3, 4; 2 Pet. i. 13–15). Essentially, therefore, the Church's doctrine and preaching is a

* [LÜNEMANN: "*even to its*—the wrath's—*end*, that is, the wrath of God has come upon them to its extreme limit, so that it must now discharge itself; now must judgment take the place of the previous long-suffering and patience." To the same effect ALFORD and ELLICOTT. See the note in *Revision*.—J. L.]

† [Comp. Exegetical Note 4, with the foot-notes.—J. L.]

propagation, reproduction, an ever new appropriation of the apostolic word. But as the preaching Apostles would not have fulfilled their task by a mere dry communication of God's revelations, but for every announcement they had to be freshly endued with the Spirit from on high, that the gospel might be brought powerfully to bear on the heart and conscience of the hearers according to their general and special needs, as, for example, on the Jews otherwise than on the Gentiles, so likewise for our preaching the objective agreement with apostolic, orthodox doctrine does not suffice, but there must always be a subjective fulness, and that in conjunction with the Holy Spirit. It is not the preaching, but the preacher, that preaches (comp. ch. i. 5, and its Exegetical Note 12, and Doctrinal Principles, No. 4). This, in fact, is precisely what is proposed in the oral word, to bring near to men in a human way the objective gift of God—to convey it to them with a spiritual, personal vivacity. The preacher is not a mere messenger, who may have no interest in the intelligence he has to bring; he is a witness, guaranteeing what he says by all that he is (John xv. 27; Luke xxiv. 48; Acts i. 8, 22; 1 John i. 2). And, accordingly, he too can and should testify to his hearers the one apostolic truth in the freedom of the spirit, ever according to their needs, in this or that form, from this side or from that. The more these two elements mutually interpenetrate, the objective agreement with the apostolic doctrine and the subjective, spiritual fulness of the individual, so much the more may even the preaching of the Church be called the word of God. At the same time we here perceive that the Divine does not in its revelation and communication exclude or suppress the human, but assimilates it, fills it with itself, and so consecrates it for its own organ. [When our Confessions teach: "Sacramenta et verbum propter ordinationem et mandatum Christi sunt efficacia, etiamsi per malos exhibeantur" (*Conf. Aug.* 8; comp. Heb. i.), this contains a truth, no doubt; and yet there is here a somewhat hasty making of a virtue out of necessity, and especially the difference between the word and sacrament, in relation to the personality of the minister, is not duly considered. Comp. 1 Cor. i. 14–17—RIGGENBACH.] Thus, in the connection of our passage with earlier statements in the Epistle, and in its harmony with expressions of the Apostle elsewhere, it furnishes essential features to the doctrine of the *verbum divinum*, both as written and as preached.

3. (Vv. 13–16.) At that time there had arisen even among the heathen a searching after truth. The great world-empires had along with the populations shaken also the gods and the religions. Light and happiness were sought in schools of philosophy, in the renewal of the mysteries, from the Goëtæ, &c. There had ensued, as in our day, a dissolution of the spiritual life—a confused, conflicting throng of all possible standpoints and attempts at deliverance. The point then was, to discriminate between *man's word and God's.* For this end the conscience is of service (2 Cor. iv. 2; v. 11), which is given to us as a compass on the swelling sea of life. When it is aroused, a separation is made between what is Divine and what is human. At this time many, at Thessalonica also, had already attached themselves as *proselytes* to the Jews, because even in the preparatory revelations of God they found the best satisfaction of their needs of conscience. Such were in a peculiar degree prepared, inwardly and outwardly, to accept the Gospel as the word of God. They were so more than the Jews, because the latter generally held the law and the prophets in the way merely of outward tradition, whereas the former consented thereto with heart and life. Thus frequently upright men, belonging as to their external position to the world, are nearer to the kingdom of God than others, who have perhaps from their youth up been associated with the pious. In like manner churches, which assume to be those in which alone salvation is to be had, or which boast of their orthodoxy, are not exactly those which bring forth the most children to the Lord, because the Spirit departs in a measure proportioned to the reliance placed, as by the Jews, on institutions, the form of doctrine, &c. (Rom. ii. 17 sqq.)

4. (Vv. 14–16.) We can here almost perceive the growth in Paul of his leading view of the position of *Gentile Christians in relation to Jewish Christians and Jews.* The latter are the proper enemies of the gospel, not only amongst those of their own nation, but also in the Gentile world; for this reason he sees the judgment now breaking in on them. On the other hand, he recognizes in the Gentile Christians the followers of the Jewish Christians, of the true congregation of God in Israel. They belong—this thought here presents itself as a matter of course—to the genuine seed of Abraham, and take the place of the exscinded branches (Rom. iv. and xi.). The condition for this is simply faith, on which such special stress is laid in v. 13; through faith a man quits his natural connections, and enters the circle of the Divine operation in the world (the connection of vv. 13 and 14). To the Jews were entrusted the λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom. iii. 2); to believers from among Jews and Gentiles is not merely entrusted outwardly the λόγος θεοῦ, but God thereby works in them with a living power (v. 13). We have thus here, in regard to the history of the kingdom of God, the genesis of Paul's objective, fundamental view respecting the setting aside of the Jews and the participation of the Gentiles in that kingdom, just as in Acts xiii. 38, 39 we have the genesis of his fundamental view of subjective salvation, of the doctrine of justification by faith. Then in the Epistle to the Romans both views are developed jointly.

5. But it must not be forgotten, that our text is not the last word of the Gentile Apostle respecting *the Jews.* It is rather in the Epistle to the Romans (chh. ix.–xi.) that he has uttered this. There, with an extreme, self-denying love, he expresses his profound, continual sorrow on account of the rejection of Israel (ch. ix. 1–3; x. 1, 2). He places the ultimate aim of his Gentile apostleship in this, that by means of the converted Gentiles the Jews should be provoked to emulation (ch. xi. 13, 14). He makes it the duty of Gentile Christians not to be proud and severe in regard to the Jewish branches broken off on account of their unbelief, because otherwise the same fate awaits us (ch. xi. 17–22). To his Gentile Church, accordingly, which has so often, alas, actually fallen into that spirit of arrogance toward the Jews which he repudiates, and is still for the mos part ensnared therein, he has rather bequeathed it as her task, by means of her walk of faith before Israel, and her loving sorrow in their behalf, to win over the blinded people. The Church has a mission of faith and love to the Jews; she has and should have a Jewish mission. If among us evangelicals this obligation is again here and there acknowledged

and discharged, yet these efforts are but feeble, slight germs and beginnings. The Jewish mission is still far too much a thing singular, peculiar; it is too little sustained by the intercessory sympathy of the believing Church. We must in this thing learn to walk more fully in the steps of our Apostle and of the Lord Himself, of whom in reference to this very people Matt. ix. 36–38 stands written. The Jewish mission, moreover, is in a quite special sense the mission also of hope. For the very last word of the Gentile Apostle respecting Israel is this, that the entire people shall yet be saved, and from the receiving of them again shall a new life stream forth to the nations of the world (Rom. xi. 12, 15, 23 sqq.). This national conversion of Israel is, indeed, not a matter that we can introduce; with other developments in the kingdom of God, it is connected with the coming of Christ (Matt. xxiii. 39; Acts iii. 19–21) [Zech. xii. xiii. xiv.—J. L.]. But in order to this, to say nothing of the salvation of individual souls, the Jewish mission has to perform the office of a forerunner, and prepare the way.

6. The result of the entire development of the Jewish people during more than fifteen centuries was their division into a *believing minority* (v. 14) and an *unbelieving majority* (vv. 15, 16), which oppressed and persecuted the former. Already, indeed, had the prophets prophesied of the remnant which alone should be converted (comp. Rom. ix. 27–29; xi. 1–10). This division [*Scheidung*] being completed, there came the crisis [*Entscheidung*], the judgment (*κρίσις* includes both) in the destruction of Jerusalem, from which the believers were delivered (Pella, &c.), whereas ruin befell the unbelieving people. The same result will follow the development also of the New Testament Church and of the Christian nations. On this rests the deep, biblical truth of the distinction between *the visible and the invisible Church*. We too stand in the time of separation, and are advancing toward the crisis.

7. (Vv. 15, 16.) It is worthy of notice that the ideas of vv. 15 and 16 obviously *lean on a sentence of the Lord*, and are evolved from it. Comp. with v. 15 Matt. xxiii. 34; Luke xi. 49: *ἀποστελῶ προφήτας καὶ ἀποστόλους καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενοῦσι καὶ ἐκδιώξουσιν*, and with v. 16 Matt. xxiii. 32: *καὶ ὑμεῖς πληρώσατε τὸ μέτρον τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν*, and v. 36: *ἥξει ταῦτα πάντα ἐπὶ τὴν γενεὰν ταύτην*. We thus see how, under the illumination of the Spirit, the words of the Lord and the Apostle's own experiences originated his thoughts. At another time it was words of the Lord, which the Apostle received in immediate revelations from heaven. In his eschatological teachings which we shall have later to consider, we shall see both kinds of words coöperating, and along with them Old Testament prophecy. The sayings of Jesus were evidently not unknown to Paul. With him they frequently sound still in a freer form (preceding the written determination of them).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

V. 13. RIEGER: Where we said: *I am glad, I ever think of it without joy*, there the spirit, in which Scripture is written, impels us to say: *We thank God*, that He may ever be acknowledged as the Giver of these joyful providences, and that joy itself may be so seasoned with salt, that the flesh shall be less able to attribute aught to itself.—J. MICH. HAHN: How greatly must it rejoice a servant of the Lord, when he is permitted also to see fruits of his labor! Or are we going to find fault with this joy, even though it be a joy in the Lord? Or have we perchance any cause to blame the Apostle, when, for the strengthening of the faith of those dear to him, he exhibits to them something of the fair fruits of the Spirit? Did not Jesus Himself first tell His churches of whatever good things they had, and then of their evil, if they had any?—RIEGER: Perhaps some one thinks, it was possible for the Thessalonians at once to accept as the word of God the word from the mouth of such a gifted Apostle; but who will require of us now, that we accept for God's word everything that sounds from pulpits? That time also had its own difficulties. Paul was not regarded at Thessalonica with quite the same degree of respect that we can now feel toward him. Outwardly he was to be looked upon as a mechanic (v. 9); inwardly the opposition he had to endure gave him great trouble. The acceptance in these circumstances of his word as the word of God was promoted by means, that would still be effective in the case of our expositions at the present day—by searching the Scriptures, whether those things are so (Acts xvii. 11). That at least accept as God's word, which thou canst so accept with the concurrence of thy conscience.—The apostolic word (the word of the Bible) is God's word, and certifies itself as such by its Divine, spiritual working in us (the witness of the Holy Ghost).—ROOS: You experience a Divine working within you. Before you believed, there was none of this Divine working. It exists while you believe, and ever since you believe. You feel it, and may thence infer that what you believe is the word of God.—THE SAME: Is it not the effect of the Divine working, that you can allow yourselves to be harassed by people of your nation, without becoming thereby disheartened or enraged? Who has at any time seen this fruit of the Spirit in an unbelieving Gentile or Jew? Thus the patience and faith of the saints (Rev. xiii. 10; xiv. 12)—these two main elements of the suffering and contending Church—are likewise the main proofs of the Divine character of her foundation, as laid in the apostolic word. In this sense the Church is the proof of the Divine character of Scripture (comp., at ch. i. 6, 7, Doctrinal Principles, No. 5). This is, indeed, no glorious proof, such as might strike even the natural sense, the merely logical or mathematical understanding. On the contrary, it is a proof from her humiliation. But the very fact that the Church of Jesus amidst all depressing and adverse circumstances, and while having the whole world opposed to her, still endures, is a proof that supernatural, Divine powers here rule—that Jesus has given to her the glory which He received from the Father (John xvii. 22; 1 Pet. iv. 14).—The preached word as God's word (comp. Luke x. 16): What this includes, 1. for preachers (see Doctrinal Principles, No. 2), 2. for hearers: a. the obligation not to carry themselves with indifference or even offensively toward the word, but to receive it as a real message from God attentively and willingly; b. the blessing, that from the word thus received there proceed Divine influences upon us.—PFAFF: God's word cannot be without stir and fruit, wherever it is but allowed to rule, any more than fire and light in cold and darkness.—ZWINGLI: The persecutors of God's word, in order to render it odious, put forward the name of Luther or Zwingli. The believer alone can decide whether it is God's word or man's; that is,

when God works in the hearers, and arouses and quickens within them the external, preached word, so that a new man is born.

V. 14. See on v. 13.—Roos: Novices in Christianity are commonly spared by the Lord sharp trials; but this was not the experience of the Thessalonians, the Lord often indeed showing that He does not always act according to one rule.—Though in our Christian world relations are in part changed from what they were then, yet even now also the convert has often to suffer, and that severely, from kinsmen and other companions. But let us be thoroughly penetrated by the power of the Divine word, and we are thereby enabled to hearken unto God more than unto the dearest of men. Then too have we the best hope of drawing after us those connected with us, when they see how the truth is sacred and precious to us above all things else; this inspires them first with respect for it, and afterwards perhaps with love to it.—Bengel: The same fruits, the same afflictions, the same experiences of believers of all places and times afford an excellent criterion of evangelical truth.—Roos: A congregation or a household of believers may take comfort from the example of others, and, in particular, converts in Christianity may do so from the example of older Christians.—Zwingli: The churches in Judea believed first on the Lord Jesus, and then the Gentiles also followed them; they did not, therefore, follow the Roman church or the Pope. [Moreover, the promise given to Peter, Matt. xvi. 18 sq., was fulfilled in Jerusalem at Pentecost and afterwards, Acts ii sqq., not in Rome.—Riggenbach.]

[Matthew Henry: The cross is the Christian's mark: if we are called to suffer, we are called only to be followers of the churches of God; *so persecuted they the prophets that were before you*, Matt. v. 12.—J. L.]

Vv. 15, 16. On the Jews, see Doctrinal Principles, Nos. 3–6.—The sin of the Jews was peculiarly grievous, and more grievous than that of the Gentiles; for it consisted not merely in the doing of evil, but in the rejection of the help offered them against the evil, in their hostility to the messengers of salvation, in hardening themselves against the ever new and higher revelations and more urgent invitations of God (Matt. xxi. 33 sqq.; xxii. 3–7). Indeed, the real sin is unbelief (Mark xvi. 15 sq.; John xvi. 9; v. 46 sq.). What was true, therefore, at that time of the Jews is now true of Christians; since the light shines now for us, for us is the day of salvation.—Bengel: Stubborn resistance to the word is that which most of all fills up the measure of sin. And Rieger: He who neglects his own salvation grudges to see in others greater zeal for their salvation; and so by the persecution of others is the measure of sins commonly filled up.—Diedrich: To love Christ, and that alone, is truly to love humanity; for true humanity is in Him alone, and by His word it is propagated and trained.—There is among us Christians also a Jewish illiberality, which thinks to please God by drawing the circle in some one sense very tight. This is a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge (Rom. x. 2), a zeal which, as with the Jews, is ever connected somehow with self-righteousness (v. 3), and does not duly understand Christ as the end of the law (v. 4). Let us allow grace to be really grace, and we shall recognize it also in its universality, nor will we make the strait gate still straiter. We learn to unite with a strict conscience a wide heart and a free vision.—Pfaff: God seldom punishes the first sin, but He suffers iniquity to mount for a certain period and to a certain pitch. When it has reached the measure fixed by Him, He breaks in with His judgment; but this limit is not very discernible before the event. Foretokens of it, however, are not obscurely to be inferred from, for example, the long duration and heinousness of the sins, from contempt of the richly proffered means of grace, from obduracy, &c.—Burkitt: It is a singular support to suffering saints, to consider that Christ and His Apostles suffered before them, and by His sufferings has sanctified a state of affliction and persecution to them.—A spirit of persecution seems ofttimes to run in a blood, and passes from parent to child through many generations. The Jews killed Christ, stoned the prophets, and persecuted the Apostles. — Paul ranks them that are enemies to the preaching of the gospel with the obstinate shedders of Christ's blood; they are enrolled amongst the capital enemies of mankind.—J. L.]

II.

Ch. II. 17–Ch. III. 13.

What Paul did for the Thessalonians after his departure.

Ch. II. 17–20.

1. He had once and again earnestly purposed to come unto them, but was hindered.

17 But we, brethren, being taken [having been bereaved by separation] from
you [1] for a short time, in presence, not in heart, endeavored the more abundantly
18 [the more ab. end.] [2] to see your face with great desire. Wherefore [3] we would
have [wished to, ἠθελήσαμεν] come unto you, even I Paul, once and again [both
19 once and again, καὶ ἅπαξ καὶ δίς]; but [and, καί] Satan hindered us. For what is
our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing [glorying] [4]? *Are* [Or *are*] [5] not even ye
[ye also, καὶ ὑμεῖς], in the presence of [before, ἔμπροσθεν] our Lord Jesus Christ [6]
20 at His coming? For ye are our glory and joy.

[1] V. 17.—[ἀπορφανισθέντες ἀφ' ὑμῶν. German: *verwaiset von euch;* Vaughan: "literally, *orphaned from you.*" The double ἀπό emphasizes the fact of separation; ὀρφανισθ., the feeling of bereavement and desolation that ensued.—Peile, Ellicott, Vaughan and others: *torn from you;* Peile adding, *and bereaved.* Jowett: *bereaved in being taken from you;* Robinson: "*bereaved* and separated."—J. L.]

[2] V. 17.—[The Greek order, "throwing the emphasis more distinctly on the *more abundantly*" (Ellicott).—J. L.]

[3] V. 18.—Instead of διό Lachmann, Lünemann [Tischendorf in the first and latest editions, Alford, Ellicott] and others, read, after Sin. A. B. D.[1] F. G. and some other manuscripts, διότι, whereas Tischendorf (ed. 2), De Wette, Reiche and others, retain διό of the received text. At any rate διότι must be = *on which account, therefore*, and so equivalent to διό, as Lünemann also supposes; but elsewhere διότι is with Paul = *because;* comp. in our Epistle ch. ii. 8; iv. 6.

[4] V. 19.—[καυχήσεως. See the English margin, and 2 Cor. vii. 4; comp. also Rom. xv. 17, and the several instances (6 out of 12) in which the noun is in our version rendered *boasting.*—J. L.]

[5] V. 19.—[The ἤ before οὐχὶ καί is wanting in Sin.[1], but was added by correction; and the same thing is true of ἡ before χαρά in v. 20.—J. L.]

[6] V. 19.—[Ellicott: "The addition χριστοῦ (*Rec.* with F. G. L.; many Vv.) is rightly rejected by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and most modern editors," and our German text. It is wanting in Sin.—J. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. (V. 17.) **But we.**—Ἡμεῖς, emphatic in itself and by its position in front: *As to what concerns us.* Having spoken, vv. 13–16, of the Thessalonians (comp. the ὑμεῖς standing foremost with like emphasis in v. 14), Paul again reverts to himself, in order to do away with a second imputation or doubt, as if, since he has been gone from the Thessalonians, after they had been readily persuaded and won over, he had left off caring for them. *Suspicionem contemtus et negligentiæ prævenit* (CALVIN; similarly PELT and others). Thus, as the first section (ch. i. 2–ii. 16) sketches for us a lively picture of Paul's ministry at Thessalonica and of the founding of the church there, a like sketch is given in the second section (ch. ii. 17–iii. 13) of the manner in which, during the interval of some six months that has since elapsed, the founder of the church has cared for it and been active in its behalf. This authentic information respecting the Apostle's doings in the establishment and rearing of churches is of high value.—[ἡμεῖς, resumed from v. 13, and now contrasted—δέ—with the persecuting Jews of vv. 15, 16. So LÜNEMANN, ALFORD, ELLICOTT.—J. L.]

2. **Bereaved of you.**—CHRYSOSTOM: Paul does not say *separated*, but more than that. Ὀρφανός and ὀρφανίζω are even in the classics used, not merely of children bereaved of their parents, but also of parents bereaved of their children, and in other similar relations. The expression is one of tenderness, and belongs to the same category as the figure of the mother (vv. 7, 8) and of the father (v. 11) [so that Paul does not really compare himself to a child, as CHRYSOSTOM &c. improperly assume.—RIGGENBACH]. The Apostle would, first of all, intimate to his readers, that, so far from having forgotten them, his separation from them has been for him a painful experience. Hence also the two additions: *for the space of an hour*, that is, *only a very short time*, as we say: *for a moment* (elsewhere πρὸς ὥραν, *for a short time*, Philem. 15; Gal. ii. 5; 2 Cor. vii. 8, or πρὸς καιρόν, *for a time at least limited*, Luke viii. 13; 1 Cor. vii. 5; here both are strengthened by being joined together), and: *in presence only, not in heart*, which ever remained with you (dative of reference, comp. 1 Cor. v. 3; and, on the opposition between πρόσωπον and καρδία, 2 Cor. v. 12; 1 Sam. xvi. 7, LXX.). Thus: We had almost no sooner been parted from you, and that only outwardly, not inwardly, than we again had a great longing to see you. [Πρὸς καιρὸν ὥρας does not state that the separation altogether lasts but a short time, as if Paul here anticipated the fulfilment of the wish expressed in ch. iii. 10 (DE WETTE, KOCH), or even thought of the reunion at the approaching parousia (OLSHAUSEN).—RIGGENBACH].

3. **Endeavoured quite earnestly [the more abundantly endeavoured].**—When the idea, with which the comparison exists, is at once understood from the context, it is not uncommon for the comparative to stand alone, and it then has the force of a positive, as in Acts xvii. 21; especially does this happen with the comparative of adverbs, as τάχιον, μᾶλλον, περισσοτέρως.* ALEX. BUTTMANN, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachgebrauchs*, 1859, p. 72 (on the form περισσοτέρως, *ibid*, p. 61). If it is desired to specify the idea round which the comparison turns, it is evidently from the connection the πρόσωπον purposely repeated in opposition to καρδία: Because the Apostle was not separated from them in heart, though in face [presence], he therefore strove the more keenly to see again their face also.† Less suitable supplements are introduced by others.‡ Ἐν πολλῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ is a reiterated confirmation of ἐσπουδάσαμεν. The one confirmation stands at the beginning, the other not less emphatically at the close, of the sentence. Here also the Apostle's love again shows itself so fervent, and as it were that of a bridegroom, that CHRYSOSTOM, impressed thereby, remarks: ἐρώμενος ἦν μανικός τις καὶ ἀκάθεκτος καὶ ἀκαρτέρητος εἰς φιλίαν.—**To see your face** is a select phrase of love, instead of the more prosaic *to come unto you* of v. 18; comp. ch. iii. 10.

4. (V. 18.) **Wherefore we wished to come unto you.**—From the general disposition, v. 17, proceeded positive resolutions, for the non-fulfilment of which Paul is not to be blamed.—Ἐγὼ μὲν Παῦλος: μέν *solitarium* for the greater prominence of the subject. From this too we see, as from καρδίας v. 4, and ψυχάς v. 8, that in the first person plural Paul intends to include Silvanus and Timothy (LÜNEMANN). Had he meant himself alone by it, the addition of ἐγὼ μὲν Παῦλος would have been unnecessary. But here especially he had to distinguish himself, because indeed Timothy had in the meanwhile come to Thessalonica. But having once singled himself out, he afterwards speaks even of himself alone in the plural; so even in our verse ἡμᾶς, and with peculiar distinctness in ch. iii. 1, 2.—Καὶ ἅπαξ καὶ δίς, not simply δίς, nor yet ἅπαξ καὶ δίς (which is used indefinitely = *more than once*), but stronger than the former expression and more precise than the latter: *both once and twice, not only*

* [Περισσοτέρως occurs eight times in Paul's other Epistles (besides Heb. ii. 1 and xiii. 19), and in some of those instances does it stand for the positive.—J. L.]

† [So DE WETTE, KOCH, ELLICOTT, and others. The objection to this is, not merely that, had the separation been in heart, there would have been no desire whatever to see them again (LÜNEMANN), but that οὐ καρδίᾳ is simply an incidental, parenthetical correction of the main thought, ἀπορφανισθέντες ἀφ' ὑμῶν. I prefer CALVIN's explanation: The writer's love, instead of being lessened by absence, was rather the more inflamed thereby (and so ARETIUS, GILL, WINER, WORDSWORTH, VAUGHAN, and others).—J. L.]

‡ [See Notes in my *Revision* of this verse.—J. L.]

once but twice (comp. Phil. iv. 16): "*testatur non subitum fuisse fervorem, qui statim refrixerit, sed hujus propositi se fuisse tenacem, quum varias occasiones captaverit*" (CALVIN).

5. **And Satan hindered us.**—Instead of δέ, Paul chooses the Hebraistic connective, which in this case is almost the more energetic.—*Satan*, the personal devil (comp. ch. iii. 5), in whose existence, therefore, Paul not merely believes, but refers to his agency even such comparatively trifling and external matters, because therein there lies prepared a hindrance to the kingdom of God (comp. Eph. vi. 12; otherwise at Rom. i. 13; xv. 22; Acts xvi. 6 sq.). The Apostle, then, does not everywhere, and as a matter of course, speak of Satan, but he knows how with testing insight to distinguish. There is nothing about him of mere cant. In what the *restraint* consisted, we know not; only it cannot have been an accumulation of business, or anything of that sort, but must have been something of evil—whether on the side of the Thessalonians or on that of Paul. In the first case we should have to think with DE WETTE &c. of the enemies of the gospel at Thessalonica, whose hatred had been a source of danger to the Apostle on his arrival in Thessalonica; in the other case, either, with CHRYSOSTOM and others, of trials in the churches where Paul had since been, which rendered a removal from them impossible for him, or, perhaps better, of some sickness of the Apostle, and in connection with this we might think of Satan's messenger, 2 Cor. xii. 7—a topic, it is true, on which we know just nothing very clear and certain. (Comp. also ch. iii. 7.) It is even very possible that both kinds of reasons concurred; that the first time, for example, and this would best agree with v. 17, Paul desired to turn back again to Thessalonica from Berœa, but was hindered in that by the Thessalonian Jews (Acts xvii. 13.—See CALVIN, BENGEL, and others.)

6. (V. 19.) **For.**—Paul gives the reason of his longing after the Thessalonians, and of his repeated purpose to come unto them. *Illum desiderii ardorem inde confirmat, quia in ipsis felicitatem suam quodammodo repositam habeat; perinde enim valet hæc sententia ac si dixisset: Nisi me ipsum obliviscar, necesse est ut vos expetam* (CALVIN).

7. **Who* [What] is our hope,** &c.—Ἢ οὐχὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς belongs to τίς, and it is, of course, merely incidental that ἤ is coincident with the ἤ before χαρά and στέφανος; ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ κυρίου &c. belongs to ἐλπὶς ἢ χαρά &c.† But ἢ οὐχὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς is purposely put between, so that ἔμπροσθεν &c. attaches itself immediately to these words, because the Apostle would have it observed that, so far from his relation to them being a transient one, it is rather to reach on to the coming of Christ, and verify itself before the eyes of the Lord.—*Hope and joy*, here, of course, objective = the subject of hope and joy. This the Thessalonians are not, in so far as Paul hopes in regard to them that they shall be found blameless (LÜNEMANN), but in so far as they are the fruits of his ministry, after which the Lord at His return will inquire (see Luke xix. 15). To this also there is special reference in στέφανος καυχήσεως, an expression derived from the garland that crowns the competitor at the goal in the successfully contested race (1 Cor. ix. 25; 2 Tim. ii. 5; iv. 8). Καύχησις, moreover, is not *glory* in the objective sense, but *glorying;* not *gloria*, but *gloriatio;* and so a crown for glorying = in which I may glory (comp. Ez. xvi. 12; xxiii. 42; Prov. xvi. 31; LXX.). Roos: We hope on your account to have some great experience at the coming of Christ; we shall then be able to rejoice over you; we shall be able to parade with you, as one parades with a crown won in a contest of the games.—Ye *also*, as well as other churches; those, for example, in Philippi or Corinth (see Phil. iv. 1; 2 Cor. i. 14—parallelisms also for the expression).

8. (V. 20.) **Ye are verily* [For ye are],** &c.—Γάρ confirms and strengthens the readily understood affirmation in the oratorical question of v. 19 (comp. WINER, p. 396). **Our glory and joy.** The expression *glory* [*Herrlichkeit*] is properly retained in translation here also by EWALD and J. MICH. HAHN, and is by the latter emphasized in a theosophic way. Δόξα is weakened, when rendered merely by *renown* or *honor* [LÜNEMANN: *Ruhm;* LUTHER, DE WETTE: *Ehre.*—J. L.] (Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 7, where the woman is called the δόξα of the man, the man the εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα of God; and 2 Cor. viii. 23, where approved brethren are distinguished by the title, δόξα Χριστοῦ.) As δόξα in God Himself is His life-impression, life-form (see at v. 12 Doctrinal Principles, No. 8), so with such genitives it denotes the representation of the life, resting on the communication of life,—the copy, standing in essential connection with the original, belonging to it, and forming as it were one whole with it, so that the latter is surrounded by it with a halo, as the sun by its beams, as the head by the crown (δόξα parallel with στέφανος καυχήσεως). Thus it is with the man and the woman taken from him; with Christ and believers; with Paul and the spiritual children begotten by him.—That such objective, actual glory then becomes in the subjective experience a matter of *joy*, lies in the nature of the case.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. (V. 18.) *Satan* appears in Scripture in a threefold activity; as tempter and seducer, as accuser, as destroyer. In the first relation he is the first and perpetual author of sin amongst men (ὁ πειράζων, ch. iii. 5; Matt. iv. 3; ὁ πλανῶν, Rev. xii. 9). As accuser (κατήγωρ, Rev. xii. 10), he seeks, when the sin is accomplished, to make the most of it with lying exaggeration before the Divine Judge (Zech. iii. 1), and also to exhibit it in the worst possible colors before our inner judge, the conscience, in order to bind the sinner inwardly, rendering him fainthearted and paralyzing his resistance to sin. Here belong the two most common names of the devil, the Hebrew הַשָּׂטָן, properly *adversary*, especially in court (comp. לְשִׂטְנוֹ, Zech. iii. 1, and ἀντίδικος, 1 Pet. v. 8), and the Greek διάβολος, *informer*, *slanderer*, *defamer*, properly one who strikes through with words. As destroyer (comp. Ἀπολλύων, Rev. ix. 11) Satan works, in so far as he, as prince of the fallen world, sets in motion all the

* [So LUTHER, and other German versions.—J. L.]

† [This is frequently indicated by a comma after καυχήσεως, and another after ὑμεῖς.—J. L.]

* [*Ihr seid ja*—making the γάρ intensive, as is done also by LUTHER, SCHOLEFIELD, ELLICOTT, and many others. But the rendering of our common version is quite as good;—the 20th verse now *justifying*, as if "after reconsideration" (WEBSTER and WILKINSON), the confident tone of the previous question by the triumphant assertion of what is there only strongly implied. The reader will notice likewise the emphatic ἐστε.—J. L.]

powers of physical and moral evil against salvation, the kingdom of God, and in behalf of mischief, which in the last instance is ἀπώλεια, eternal damnation. It is thus that he appears in our text. In the two first relations he is a liar; in the last, and—in so far as that lies as the ultimate aim at the bottom also of the earlier—in all three, a murderer (John viii. 44). In the case of Judas he succeeded first in his trade as a seducer, then in that of an accuser; hence the end of the former in despair and suicide, whereby he fell a prey to the destroyer.

2. (Vv. 19, 20.) Paul's hope is to be adorned with the fruits of his ministry before the Lord at His coming. Holy Scripture everywhere lays stress on this point, that *every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labor* (1 Cor. iii. 8). The fundamental relation of every man to God in respect of faith or unbelief decides the question of his happiness or misery (Eph. ii. 8; Mark xvi. 16; John iii. 18, 36; v. 24). But within these two great classes there is still possible an extraordinary diversity in the life-acting of faith or unbelief—in practical honesty and dishonesty. Through faith we are become children of God; but now we must yield ourselves to be also trained as such, and renewed ever more and more into the image of the Father and of our First-born Brother (χάρις παιδεύουσα, Tit. ii. 11, 12; comp. Heb. xii. 7-10; Col. iii. 10; Rom. xii. 2; viii. 29; 2 Cor. iii. 18), that we remain not weak, new-born children, but grow to the ripe age of a perfect man (Heb. v. 13, 14; comp. Eph. iv. 13, 14). We are rooted in the right ground and soil, and bear within us the full germ of life; but for that very reason it concerns us now to grow and bring forth fruit (Col. ii. 7; i. 10, 11; Matt. xiii. 23; Mark iv. 26-28; John xv. 2; Phil. i. 9-11). The whole walk of a man contributes to the formation of his disposition and character; all the issues of the life exert a formative reacting influence on our inner man—impress and stamp themselves also in ourselves (*character* from χαράσσω). In the Divine judgment, therefore, justification and condemnation are made to depend even on our words (Matt. xii. 36, 37); but especially is our fate determined according to our works, or (in the singular) our work, life-work, so far as therein is exhibited the total result of the religious and moral life, rearing itself on the foundation of faith or unbelief (Rom. ii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 10; Rev. ii. 23; xx. 12 sq.; xxii. 12; Matt. xvi. 27; John v. 29). As a man walks, so he becomes; and as he becomes, so is he also in death; his works do follow him (Rev. xiv. 13), and agreeably thereto his destiny in that other world spontaneously shapes itself; on which account there will be among the blessed and among the lost very different degrees of glory or of torment (comp., for example, Luke xix. 17-19; xii. 47 sq.; Matt. xi. 22-24; 1 Cor. iii. 12-15. Of course, this is not the place to go into more precise definitions respecting heaven, hades, hell, the first and second resurrections, &c.). By this view justice is done also to the scriptural idea of reward, without our falling into the Catholic idea of merit. And in this way, especially, sanctification, a spiritual walk, inward growth, and the outward activity of the life, here acquire an importance which in the original Protestantism was not duly recognized and acknowledged—a defect, that has been in many ways prejudicial, and here and there is so still, to our evangelical doctrine and practice. It is true, our Confessions teach emphatically, that faith by an inward necessity brings forth good works; and yet the main point of view, from which they had to handle this doctrine over against Catholicism, was the negative one: that righteousness and salvation depend neither for their attainment nor their preservation on good works. For this reason, and the kindred one, that for the doctrine of faith and justification that of regeneration was neglected, it was impossible for the idea of sanctification, and what is connected therewith also in eschatology, to reach fully its positive, scriptural development and significance. Meanwhile, there is by no means any want of good suggestions, particularly in Melancthon's excellent discussion *de dilectione et impletione legis* in the Apology for the Augsburg Confession.

3. (Vv. 19, 20.) Whatever work we perform in an earthly calling, even in art and science as such, belongs to the domain of the perishable—of means, not of everlasting ends. Only what of good or evil is wrought in the souls of men is of eternal import. And the highest service is to help a soul to the life in God. On this rests the singular dignity, and also the responsibility, of the ministerial office. In an altogether peculiar sense, this is *work for the day of Jesus Christ*, whether we are now good shepherds or hirelings.

4. Paul hopes on the day of the Lord to be surrounded by those converted through him, as by a glory. This δόξα, this crown of glorying, is the true halo, when, coming into the presence of the heavenly Judge, one is able to say: Behold, I and the children whom God hath given me. At His coming the Lord will present to Himself His entire Church glorious, without spot or wrinkle (Eph. v. 27; 2 Cor. xi. 2). But the Church is an organism, not merely in the sense that the body as a whole depends on the head, but also in that it is composed of various members, the weaker depending on the stronger. Thus do spiritual children hang on their spiritual fathers, and are as it were embraced in them, and ruled by them. In this sense Paul hopes to be surrounded by his Gentile churches; in this sense is the promise made to the Twelve of ruling the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 29, 30). This agrees with the fundamental view which Scripture, in this case also the true interpreter of experience, takes of humanity. It regards it, not as an atomic mass of individuals, but as an organism, depending for its natural life on Adam, for its spiritual life on Christ; and that in such a manner, that from these two genealogical heads the membership branches off to every single individual. Hence the importance of progenitors and their primitive doings in the sphere itself of nature and of race (Adam, Shem, Ham, Japheth, Abraham, David, &c.; Adam's fall, Ham's misdeed, Abraham's faith, the gracious treatment of David's descendants for David's sake, &c.), just as prominent prophetic and apostolic persons are centres of light and union in the spiritual sphere. The case is similar with the Lord of the world's history.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

V. 17. The Apostle's loving union with his churches even when absent from them. J. MICH. HAHN: In the Apostle, who certainly loves all the children of God, and even all the Lord's dearly redeemed, with a priestly, cordial love, there is yet a predilection for his spiritual children (1 Cor. iv. 15;

Gal. iv. 19). The reason of that is the closer affinity of spiritual kindred. If it is so in the earthly nature, and cannot be said to be improper, who then shall blame it in the spiritual? Whoever blames it, would mend an arrangement of the Creator, who is also our Redeemer.—RIEGER: As matters now stand with us, we are unable to estimate what a benefit it was to come together in person, and strengthen one another concerning the common faith.—DIEDRICH: Christians may well even long to *see* one another, whilst they are in the flesh; worldlings are soon fain to get out of one another's way.—[The same principles of the new creature, that led the primitive Christians to delight in *personal* intercourse with one another (comp. Acts iv. 23; xx. 38; Rom. i. 11; xv. 24; 1 Thess. iii. 6; 2 Tim. i. 4; 2 John 12; 3 John 14), were still more powerfully operative in their relations to their Lord (comp. John xiv. 3, 19; Phil. i. 23; 1 Thess. iv. 17; 1 John iii. 2; &c.—J. L.]

V. 18. CALVIN: It is certain, that whatever opposes the work of the Lord proceeds from Satan. Would that it were a firmly settled conviction in all pious souls, that Satan is continually making every effort to retard or hinder the edification of the Church! We should certainly be more intent on resisting him; we should have more at heart the preservation of sound doctrine, of which Satan takes such eager pains to rob us.—A part of that sound doctrine is the doctrine of Satan himself.—[Bishop WILSON: Non-residence. N. B. It is the work of Satan, and his desire, to keep a pastor from his flock.—J. L.]

Vv. 19, 20. It is important that a man should not merely be assured of his gracious standing and salvation, which, indeed, is the first thing and most important, but should also be zealous to bear fruit for the day of the Lord, and to be able hereafter to say to the Lord: Lord, my pound hath gained ten pounds (Luke xix. 16). He can also set his aim too low, and cover with false humility his own drowsiness and sloth.—A great and main point for the preacher, that he appear not empty before the Lord in His day.—CALVIN: At the last day Christ's servants will obtain glory and triumph according as they have spread abroad His kingdom. Therefore should they even now rejoice and glory in nothing save the blessed result of their labor, in seeing the glory of Christ advanced through their service. In this way also they will attain to a true love for the Church.—THEODORET: Paul has compared himself to a mother (v. 7), and mothers are wont to call their young children *their hope, joy*, &c.*—CHRYSOSTOM: Who would not exult in such a numerous and well-bred troop of children?—To whose lot fall these joys of spiritual paternity? Do we even know any thing of them?—The Apostle's joys and cares of spiritual fatherhood are a pattern for us also in regard to our children after the flesh, how we should be faithful in our families, and should carefully engage that not one of the members be lost.—To keep the coming of the Lord at all times before our eyes, that is to be likeminded with the Apostles.—RIEGER: In the gospel the Lord's coming shines in upon us so near, that it affords us already at every step much light for our feet.—[MATTHEW HENRY: The Apostle here puts the Thessalonians in mind, that though he could not come to them as yet, and though he should never be able to come to them, yet our Lord Jesus Christ will come; nothing shall hinder that.—BENSON (MACKNIGHT, BARNES, &c.): Paul expected to know his own converts again in the great day; and particularly to rejoice in them. We may, therefore, hope to know our friends in the future state.—J. L.]

* [In this suggestion THEODORET, as usual, follows CHRYSOSTOM. WORDSWORTH: "'These are my *jewels*,' as the Roman mother, Cornelia, said of her offspring. Comp. Prov. xvii. 6, *στέφανος γερόντων, τέκνα τέκνων, καύχημα δὲ τέκνων πατέρες αὐτῶν*."—J. L.]

CH. III. 1–5.

2. Being unable to come himself, Paul sent Timothy.

1 Wherefore, when we could no longer forbear [endure, *στέγοντες*], we thought
it good [thought good, *εὐδοκήσαμεν*; Sin., as B.: *ηὐδοκήσαμεν*] to be left at [left behind
2 in, *καταλειφθῆναι ἐν*] Athens alone, and sent Timothy our brother, and minister
of God, and our fellow-labourer [our brother and fellow-labourer with God][1] in
3 the gospel of Christ, to establish you, and to comfort you [exhort][2] concerning
[in behalf of][3] your faith, that[4] no man [no one, *μηδένα*] should be moved by
[in, *ἐν*] these afflictions; for yourselves know that we are appointed thereunto
4 [unto this we are appointed, *εἰς τοῦτο κείμεθα*]. For verily [For even, *καὶ γάρ*]
when we were with you, we told you before that we should suffer tribulation
[are to be afflicted, *μέλλομεν θλίβεσθαι*]; even as [as also, *καθὼς καί*] it came to
5 pass, and ye know. For this cause, when I [I also, *κἀγώ*] could no longer forbear [endure, *στέγων*], I sent to know your faith, lest by some means [lest haply, *μήπως*] the tempter have [had] tempted you, and our labour [toil, *κόπος*] be [should prove, *γένηται*] in vain.

[1] V. 2.—Among the many variations is that one which first lies at the basis of the different readings, and presents a suitable advance: *τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν καὶ συνεργὸν τοῦ θεοῦ* (1 Cor. iii. 9). [This reading is followed by Griesbach and nearly all the later editors, as well as by our text. Cod. Sin. thus: *τὸν ἀδ. ἡμῶν καὶ διάκονον θεοῦ*.—J. L.]

[2] V. 2.—[*παρακαλέσαι*, as in ch. iv. 1; v. 14; 2 Thess. iii. 12; &c.; here closely connected with its object in v. 3.—

The second ὑμᾶς is rejected by Schott, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott, Wordsworth (after Sin. A. B. D.[1] F. G &c.), and by our text.—J. L.]

[3] V. 2.—[*eures Glaubens halber.* This represents the reading, adopted by Griesbach and later editors generally, of ὑπέρ (Sin. A. B. D'. &c.), instead of περί.—J. L.]

[4] V. 3.—The *Recepta* τῷ is supported only by minuscules; the best manuscripts [including Sin.] give τό (see Winer, 5th edit. § 44, 5. 3).

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. (V. 1.) **Wherefore** (because ye are thus our joy, ch. ii. 20; my crown of glory, which I hope to bring before the Lord, ch. ii. 19),* **when we, &c.**; more exactly: † *as those who could not longer endure it.* Στέγω, in old Greek, *to cover*, then (of a vessel), *to contain*, and then (Philo and Paul), *to endure;* so 1 Cor. ix. 12; xiii. 7. This suits our place; but not, *to conceal.* **No longer endure,** namely, to be separated from you, and hindered from coming to you (ch. ii. 18).‡ There is tenderness in the fact, that his anxiety is scarcely hinted at, is at most intimated in the expression στέγοντες, and is not more distinctly announced till v. 5.

2. **We thought good,** were pleased (ch. ii. 8; the imperfect, continuously); here the aorist (on one occasion); CALVIN: *promtam animi inclinationem designat.* § The plural, according to the restriction already introduced by the explanation in ch. ii. 18, of Paul alone; for ch. iii. 1 sqq. is closely connected with what precedes; equivalent, therefore, to the singular in v. 5. Otherwise GROTIUS, BENGEL, Roos, HOFMANN, who, because the singular first comes at v. 5, think that the plural here does not denote Paul alone (and so Roos and HOFMANN at v. 6 also). But all three (ch. i. 1) cannot be meant; Timothy, being sent forth, is not one of those left alone. We should thus have to understand by the plural two out of the three; but that is more arbitrary than to explain it (after ch. ii. 18) of Paul alone, [as is done by SCHOTT, DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN, ALFORD.—J. L.] Generally, indeed, it is he who decides. With this too Acts xviii. 5 is at least more readily reconciled.

3. (V. 2.) **In Athens, &c., and sent, &c.**; therefore from Athens. According to Acts xvii. 15 Paul sends a message from Athens to Berœa, that Silas and Timothy should come to him with all speed; according to Acts xviii. 5 they both came to him at Corinth from Macedonia. With this agrees 1 Thess. iii. 6: Timothy comes from Thessalonica (Macedonia) to Paul, with whom Silvanus also is present during the writing of the letter. The narrative in the Acts has in the interval a gap, that can only be filled up conjecturally. Either (1 a.) both had come to Athens, and from that place had again been sent to the north, Timothy to Thessalonica, Silas perhaps to Philippi (also in Macedonia). (If ἐπέμψαμεν included also Silvanus, this would be a necessary supposition.) Or (1 b.) only Timothy had come to Athens, and been sent to Thessalonica,‖ Silas being still detained in Berœa (likewise in Macedonia). Or lastly (2.) both did not come to Paul, so long as he lingered in Athens, but the latter (moved, it may be, by accounts of persecutions in Thessalonica) sent after the first order (for them to come) a second in like manner from Athens to Berœa; that Timothy, instead of coming to him directly, should rather go in his stead to Thessalonica, and only after that follow in his route (so HUG; WIESELER, *Chronol. des apostolischen Zeitalters*, 249). He would thus have countermanded Timothy's expected arrival in Athens. This would accord well with ἐπέμψ. (without ἐκεῖθεν); less naturally with καταλειφθ., which, strictly taken, signifies not merely *left alone*, but *left behind alone.* Difficulty there is none, only a gap, which cannot be filled up incontestably in only one way.

4. **Our brother,** &c.—The Cod. B. gives, *our brother and fellow-laborer;* A. and Sin., *our brother and God's servant;* others, *and God's servant and fellow-laborer;* the *Recepta* (not altogether after late authorities only), *our brother and God's servant and our fellow-laborer*, where the arrangement is wanting in solidity; we should have to justify it perhaps thus: as God's servant he is our fellow-laborer. But the reading which first lies at the basis of all the variations is that followed above (D. Ambrosiaster); διάκονος θεοῦ is common, sometimes in a comprehensive (2 Cor. vi. 4), sometimes in a narrower sense (Acts vi.; 1 Tim. iii. 8). *My* fellow-laborer, says Paul, Rom. xvi. 21; *God's* fellow-laborers, 1 Cor. iii. 9. In the glad tidings of Christ; in the act, that is, of preaching the same.—It can scarcely be said that Paul gives Timothy these several titles of honor involuntarily, and on account merely of the latter being his faithful helper (LÜNEMANN); he probably means also to show the Thessalonians what a helper he has deprived himself of for their sake (CHRYSOSTOM); *quo melius ostenderet quam bene illis consultum voluerit* (CALVIN); and at the same time to certify his own perfect agreement with Timothy, and confirm whatever he has done (VON GERLACH). Somewhat too refined perhaps is HOFMANN's conjecture, that they were not, because Paul had not come himself, to think too highly of the coming of Timothy, and that he desires to guard aginst this.

5. **To establish you** (in the persecutions; that Timothy was to do) **and to exhort,** literally, *to call to*, which is to be understood, according to the context, either of exhortation or of comfort (Acts xv. 32; 2 Thess. ii. 17). But Paul expresses no distrust of their standing as believers. That the oldest authorities omit ὑμᾶς after παρακ. makes no difference in the sense; nor yet that they read ὑπέρ instead of περί. For the former likewise means *on account of, in consideration of*, as in Rom. xv. 9; 2 Cor. i. 8; 2 Thess. ii. 1; at least, it is not necessary, with LÜNEMANN [JOWETT, ALFORD, ELLICOTT], to press the signification *in favor of, for the benefit of* (in order to support your faith).

6. (V. 3.) **That no one should be moved,** &c.—Σαίνω (from σάω, σαίω), in the New Testament only here, means *to move to and fro;* of dogs, *to wag the tail;* hence *to flatter, deceive through flattery* (so in many places in Wetstein). Thus BENGEL *that no one be deceived* (by enemies, relations, his own heart); similarly RÜCKERT: *blanditiis corrump*

* [So LÜNEMANN; but better, with ALFORD and ELLICOTT after THEODORET and CALVIN: Because of our affection, and unavailing desire to see you.—J. L.]

† [As better representing the subjective μηκέτι with the participle.—J. L.]

‡ [This is not expressed by our Common Version, which ELLICOTT follows, though his paraphrase also is: "no longer *able to control my longing*, &c."—J. L.]

§ [Rather, a conclusion, determination of the judgment and will, as ALFORD, ELLICOTT, &c.—J. L.]

‖ [So MACKNIGHT, PALEY (see his *Horæ Paulinæ.* ch. ix., No. iv., with JOWETT's unsatisfactory criticism), ELLICOTT and others. Comp. CONYBEARE and HOWSON's *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, London ed., vol. I. p. 409, and the Note at the end of ch. xi.—J. L.]

[a sense suggested also by WORDSWORTH, after THEOPHYLACT; likewise JOWETT: "not simply moved, but rather moved to softness."—J. L.] On the other hand, the Greek interpreters (familiar with the language), and so the moderns generally, including LÜNEMANN, understand by it, *to be moved, shaken*, like σαλευθῆναι of 2 Thess. ii. 2. HOFMANN disputes this explanation, reduces even Lünemann's examples from the classics to the sense of *deluding*, and understands thus: *in* (in the midst of, not by means of) the persecutions seeming well-wishers might delude you with suggestions.—Τῷ could not mean *because that* (as in 2 Cor. ii. 12 [13]), but must be equivalent to εἰς τό, *for the end that*, like the Hebrew לְ. But this were without example, and, besides, the accusative τό is attested by almost all the uncials. The latter LÜNEMANN [ALFORD] understands as in apposition to εἰς τὸ στηρ. &c.: *that is to say that; which is as much as to say that;*—not good. Others [SCHOTT, KOCH]: *in reference to*, as in Phil. iv. 10 (where, however, another view is possible); best (EWALD, HOFMANN [WINER, DE WETTE, ELLICOTT, WEBSTER and WILKINSON]): it marks the purport of the charge, of the παρακαλέσαι; comp. ch. iv. 1, 6.

7. **In these afflictions**; which after Paul's departure befell the Thessalonians as well as him (ch. ii. 14). From v. 4 it is inferred that they immediately subsided. That they might return any day, and did actually break forth again, is shown by 2 Thess. i. 4. CHRYSOSTOM and others err in supposing that he speaks of *his own* afflictions, by which the Thessalonians were rendered anxious, as soldiers are by the wounding of the general.

8. **For yourselves know**, without any repeated admonition of ours; know then also, that I am right in requiring, μηδένα σαίνεσθαι.—**That unto this we** (Christians generally) **are appointed**; κείμεθα like τιθέμεθα (Luke ii. 34; Phil. i. 16). Improperly KOCH: *are prostrate* (in misfortune and suffering); Phil. i. might perhaps be so understood, but not Luke ii. Rather: *by God ordained, thereunto appointed;* εἰς τοῦτο, to afflictions, as the way into the kingdom of God (Matt. v. 10–12; x. 21, 22, 34 sqq.; John xv. 18 sqq.; xvi. 2; Acts xiv. 22; 2 Tim. iii. 12).

9. (V. 4.) Καὶ γάρ, **for even, for indeed.**—You should therefore know it, from our telling you before.—**That we are to be afflicted,** μέλλομεν θλίβ. (again, Christians generally), that there awaits us; not simply equivalent to the future, but: according to God's purpose; because darkness is opposed to light, the flesh strives against the spirit. Notwithstanding such undisguised forewarning, the gospel wins believers. An example of how far the Apostle's word was from flattering speech (ch. ii. 5).—**As also it came to pass** (with you, as with us), **and ye know**; not: that it *must* come to pass, that were tautological with v. 3; but: that according to our forewarning it *has* come to pass. By this remembrance there accrued from an outward event an inward experience. As the subject of κείμεθα (v. 3) and μέλλομεν (v. 4), therefore, we understand Christians generally. HOFMANN, on the contrary: the same as in the case of ἦμεν and προελέγομεν, and so only the Apostles. No doubt, in the clause, "when *we* were with *you*," the *we* can only mean the Apostles. But in the case of κείμεθα there is nothing before to suggest this limitation; and opposed to it is the fact, that thereby the most natural connection with what precedes is disturbed. To comfort the Thessalonians in their afflictions, he reminds them of the rule that affects all Christians. But, if we understood him to say "that we *Apostles* are appointed thereunto," it is only in an ingenious, roundabout way that we could get at the point of the confirmation and exhortation: Admit no such insinuation, as that we misled you into misery, while we secured ourselves.

10. (V. 5.) **For this cause** (on account of these afflictions; unnaturally HOFMANN: because we εἰς τοῦτο κείμεθα), **when I also,** &c. OLSHAUSEN interpolates: *as you in your care for me;*—LÜNEMANN: *as the others, Timothy and the Christians in Athens;* * but there is nothing said of their having no longer endured;—HOFMANN even: *as we two, Silvanus and I, sent Timothy, so now also I alone* (the singular) *sent some one unnamed!* On the other hand, DE WETTE would refer the καί in κἀγώ to the whole sentence; without proof. Just as here after διὰ τοῦτο, so it stands at Eph. i. 15; comp. Col. i. 9 [both texts cited by De Wette.—J. L.]. And, just as there, it opposes to what was said of the Thessalonians (ye have had experience of suffering) † what he *too* now had done.—**Sent,** &c. is a resumption of v. 2. He says nothing any more about *whom* he sent; he merely adds, *for what purpose.* Nor is it any longer here, as at v. 2, what Timothy was to do, but what he thereby sought for himself. At no time mere tautological repetition. For PELT and OLSHAUSEN erroneously refer γνῶναι to Timothy, though indeed not named, as the subject; it belongs rather to the subject of the principal verb (LÜNEMANN).

11. **Your faith, whether [lest],** ‡ &c.—Everything concentrates in this, whether they stand in the faith. Without our supplying φοβούμενος, μήπως expresses solicitude, and first indeed, with the indicative preterite, in reference to what was past: whether perhaps it has already occurred; there exists oppression from without; now he is anxious to know, whether haply this had wrought inwardly so as to become a temptation for the Thessalonians, that is, to the disturbance of faith;—then, moreover, with the subjunctive, in reference to what was impending, which in this case might possibly occur; for, even though the πειρασμός should have already occurred, this would still be by no means decided; the temptation might, indeed, still be resisted, and the entire frustration of the work still be warded off. Similarly Gal. ii. 2; comp. WINER, 6 ed., 56, 2.† The tempter is Satan (ch. ii. 18); the substantival participle marks his settled characteristic (Matt. iv. 3); that is what he is always after. That the subject and the predicate are from the same stem gives emphasis to the expression. For εἰς κενόν, to come to nothing, to be frustrated, comp. Gal. ii. 2; Phil. ii. 16; Hebr. לָרִיק, לַשָּׁוְא, לְאַכְזָב, Is. lxv. 23; Jer. vi. 29; Mic. i. 14.—**Our toil**; you surely do not mean to make me so poor? he thus speaks to

* [ALFORD: "A delicate hint that Timotheus also was anxious respecting them; or it may have the same reference as καὶ ἡμεῖς, ch. ii. 13—viz. to the other Christians who had heard of their tribulation."—REVISION: "I no more than my companions."—WEBSTER and WILKINSON: "I in my sympathy with you."—J. L.]

† [Better at least than ELLICOTT: "As they had felt for the Apostle (more fully so in v. 6), so he &c."—J. L.]

‡ [RIGGENBACH translates μήπως, *ob nicht;* and in this he follows very many of the best interpreters, whose names are given in my REVISION of the verse, Note 3. But, as is there remarked, "I do not find that either the simple μή, which occurs so often, or μήπως, which occurs other 11 times (and, excepting Acts xxvii. 29, always in Paul's Epistles), is ever thus used"—that is, as an indirect interrogative—"in the New Testament."—J. L.]

their heart. It would be to their own hurt, if they fell away. But he in his love for them would reckon it a sensible loss for himself (Rieger). Now at last and in such an affectionate manner, after he has already strengthened them, does he mention the danger by name.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. (V. 1.) It was a sacrifice, to remain in so difficult a position without the outward and inward support of faithful helpers; rather to dispense with something himself, than allow the Thessalonians to want for anything. Love gives others the precedence (comp. Phil. ii. 19 sqq.). Calvin: *Desiderii illius sui fidem facit, se majorem illorum quam sui rationem habuisse ostendit.* It is at the same time an instance of that so frequent change in his plans, which was misinterpreted to his disadvantage at Corinth (2 Cor. i. 17). What was said of another servant of God is to its full extent true of him: "The singleness of his eye kept him steadfast to his purpose under all the varied and trying circumstances of his life. He changed his plans according as he observed a change in the intimations of Providence, but his purpose remained fundamentally the same—the furtherance of the gospel by all means." *Berlenburger Bibel:* A servant of the Church must accommodate himself to the circumstances of the Church, and yet in such a manner that, while doing one thing, he do not neglect another.

2. (V. 2.) The mission to Thessalonica was no small task for the youthful Timothy (1 Cor. xvi. 10, 11; according to 1 Tim. iv. 12 he needed encouragement in the presence of older men). In the Acts the presence of Timothy at the founding of the church there is not once mentioned; plainly because he was less conspicuous, and for the same reason the persecution did not affect him. Paul, however, would not have entrusted a stranger to the church with such an important commission. The Apostle understood the wisdom of selecting a gentle manager, who yet was no skulk, but in a spirit of self-sacrifice sought, as few others, the things that were Christ's (Phil. ii. 20–22). The difference of gifts is of service for different tasks. It is not every one that can root out stumps and stones, nor is this always in order. There is a time also for easy going—careful watering, and ministers with gifts adapted to that work. Even in war different enterprises are promoted by different sorts of weapons.

3. (V. 2.) *Timothy, the brother.* Care is to be taken that the name of brother do not become trite, nor yet be so claimed for a particular circle, as if it belonged to that especially, and to every member of it officially and as a matter of course. Rather it is due to *all* living Christians, to whom *Christ* addresses it (Matt. xii. 49, 50). Only on this basis is official brotherhood a truth. Elsewhere Paul calls Timothy his beloved, faithful, genuine child (1 Cor. iv. 17; 1 Tim. i. 2 [and 18]). The child, dependent on his father, grows up to be an independent brother. In the spiritual life it is possible for the degrees of kindred to become variable without damage, since through hallowed, tender love they coexist, yet without confusion. Even the common human relations show images of this. A son when grown up may find his friend in his father.

4. That we are called God's fellow-laborers, is for us a high dignity. God will not drive everything through alone (Rieger), but will act also by means of our agency, weak as it may be, yet strengthened and continually sustained by Him alone. For He it is, indeed, that worketh in us to will and to do, and then gives the increase (Phil. ii. 13; 1 Cor. iii. 6, 10); nevertheless he requires of us faithfulness (1 Cor. iv. 2)—that we lay hold of what He proffers.

5. (V. 3.) Confirmation and exhortation are needed even by believers, to arm them against threatening and temptation. A comfortable support is communion in prayer. Calvin: The communion of saints includes this, that the faith of one member should be a comfort to others. But to fasten on to men as men would be unsound and unprofitable, unless we allowed ourselves to be aroused to the recollection of what lies in our own consciousness of faith (*ye yourselves know*)—unless, animated by the example, we made use for ourselves of the open way of access to the Lord.

6. Chrysostom: Who has ears to hear, let him hear: The Christian is appointed to suffer affliction. It is, therefore, just when we are appointed to a time of refreshing, that a strange thing happens to us (1 Pet. iv. 12). According to the world's sentiment (and that of our natural sense), it is to our discredit when things go troublesome and hard with us; we almost suspect that everything is wrong with us. According to the word of God, that is rather a badge of Christians, a badge of honor; *hac lege sumus Christiani*, Calvin. The Lord, indeed, must even again show Himself as the Breaker * (2 Cor. vi. 8–10; Rom. viii. 37). Besides, affliction that befalls us as Christians on account of our faith is still something different from such natural trouble or temptation of one's own flesh, as all men must meet with. But Christians, after all, are really nothing but men on whom the Divine training takes effect; and all suffering sent by God, not merely persecution proper, can and should be turned into a cross, and as a cross be taken up and borne—as a crossing of our self-will. To be sure, our scriptural knowledge, and, on the other hand, our lively recognition of facts and ready acceptance of whatever is plainly laid on us, very often do not keep pace with each other. Hatred for Christ's name's sake is not to be provoked by us (Phil. iv. 5); † provided only we do not escape the trouble by reason of our excessive worldliness, our compliances, denials, and quenching of the pursuit of holiness. But the question always concerns only what God lays upon us, not a studied self-torture. When external persecutions fail, there may come upon us inward assaults from flesh and blood, refined and enhanced by the spirits that rule in the air—daily piercings of a needle, more irksome than the blows of a club.

7. (V. 4.) The forewarning obviates much vexation (John xiii. 19; xiv. 29; xvi. 1). Hardship, instead of frightening, is then an actual confirmation of the prediction; hostility itself must redound to the glory of the Lord. Chrysostom compares to the physician, who foresees the course of the disease, and thereby quiets his patient. God, however, beholds beforehand not merely what will happen, as if it happened without Him, but what, even of that which is wicked and hurtful, He will work as Judge, according to the relation between the seed and the harvest (Gal. vi. 7, 8); and so the Divinely opened vision discerns this working of God even in the wickedness of men.

* [*Durchbrecher*—Luther's word at Mic. ii. 13.—J. L.]
† [τὸ ἐπιεικὲς ὑμῶν, your "*forbearance.*"—J. L.]

8. What must the gospel be as a divine power, that, with prospects so little flattering to the flesh, it yet wins believers! It is true that to a certain degree even an equivocal cause may gain by persecution. To make martyrs of men is to call forth and strengthen the spirit of contradiction. That is a noble impulse (of an independent character) caricatured (resistance to essential truth). But only in the element of truth is there a steadfast and lasting perseverance. *Berlenburger Bibel:* But is it wise management, to talk of the cross to young Christians? True wisdom conducts into a school, where we learn to be blessed. The lost blessedness is to be regained in no other way than the strait and narrow one. Tribulation, however, is laid on us, not as a legal burden, but as an evangelical condition. And this very distress must serve to purify us.

9. (V. 5.) Affliction from without becomes temptation within, insinuates itself as a trial of faith, urges to the experiment, whether we might not have less of the cross. The same word πειρασμός LUTHER translates sometimes by *Versuchung* [temptation], sometimes by *Anfechtung* [trial].* This corresponds to the two sides of the idea. The design of Satan, who against his will must serve the purpose of God, is the wicked one of overthrowing by temptation; thus it is said: God tempts no man; and even Satan finds scope for his temptations only in man's own lust (James i. 13 sqq.); and yet we are not to think it strange, we should rather count it joy, when we fall into divers temptations [LUTHER: *Anfechtungen*] (1 Pet. iv. 12; James i. 2 sqq.), as Abraham was tempted (Gen. xxii.), or Israel (Gen. xv. 25; xvi. 4). This is temptation with the Divine purpose of trial and proof, and to this end, therefore, should the prayer: "Lead us not into temptation," be directed; not: Avert from us all trial, but: Restrain it within such bounds, and give to it such an issue (1 Cor. x. 13), that it become not to us an overpowering temptation. Thus Satan himself must serve the Lord in the salvation of men. From this wonderful complication of motives, Divine, devilish, human, is explained, even alongside of the word: "We are appointed to the suffering of affliction;" that other word again: "I endured it no longer." This is neither impatience nor a faint-hearted anxiety, but the faithfulness of love in doing its own part and neglecting nothing. He has no thought of setting aside or deprecating all Divine πειρασμός; but he would assist those under trial, so that no Satanic πειρασμός should overpower, alarm, or deceive them; for both fierce foes and seeming well-wishers (Matt. xvi. 23) can work to his mind. Paul is withal a wise instructor even in this, that he just as tenderly avoids agitating them beforehand with images of terror, as he again openly announces the danger.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

V. 1. What diligence in *watering* is shown by Paul! In the case of young plants this is especially necessary. But the tender and encouraging treatment has no other aim, than to lead them on to a Christian self-dependence. Thus Paul not merely passed through among them as a proclaimer of the word, but he was their father, and continued to be their pastor.—A true Apostle is intimately knit to the souls of his children, and can never forsake them. Such a spirit of love and truth forms the true apostolic succession.

V. 2. STARKE: He incites others to do what he cannot (Eph. vi. 22).—THE SAME: A few faithful laborers can accomplish more than many unfaithful ones (1 Cor. xv. 10).*—Towards laborers worthy of the name, therefore, must the prayer of Matt. ix. 38 be directed, and also the attention of church-rulers. It is well for an assistant, whom an approved principal can commend, as Paul did Timothy.—STARKE: No man can be a true servant of God and helper in the gospel, unless he be a child of God, and on this account also a brother in Christ.

[Vv. 1, 2. MATTHEW HENRY: Those ministers do not duly value the establishment and welfare of their people, who cannot deny themselves in many things for that end.—J. L.]

V. 3. HEUBNER: The Christian's honorable calling; Christianity's first welcome: The position of a Christian, a position under the cross.—STÄHELIN: The best ground of comfort, to save us from fainting in tribulation, is to consider well and firmly believe, that God in His goodness and wisdom has appointed to every one what in his station, and according to the measure of the powers granted to him, he is to suffer. Comfort and tribulation are by turns our heavenly companions; God be praised for both!—HEUBNER: We must have a hard heart toward the temptations of sin, but a soft one toward the sufferings of our brethren.—RIEGER: It is better to be appointed to suffering in time than to wrath (ch. v. 9); to you it is given to suffer—as great a gift as: to you it is given to believe (Phil. i. 29).—DIEDRICH: We must have tribulation, for we contend with the whole world, and a mighty prince.—[BURKITT: Seeing then that afflictions are appointed to us, and we appointed to them; seeing there is a decree of God concerning them, a decree as to the matter of them, as to the manner of them, as to the measure of them, as to the time of them, when they shall commence, how far they shall advance, how long they shall continue, seeing everything in affliction is under an appointment, how meek and humble, how patient and submissive, ought the Christian's spirit to be under them, and with what steadiness of expectation may and ought he to look up to heaven for a sanctified use and improvement of them!—J. L.]

STARKE: The word of the Apostle is confirmed by all the history of the Church. Here open enemies, there false brethren. But contending Christians have the surest hope of victory over their enemies, because they contend under One as their Leader, who has overcome the world and the prince of the world.—THE SAME: Before a man rightly understands the mystery of the cross, he is offended thereby, and supposes that, if a person acts properly, outward things must also at the same time go well with him; and therefore beginners in the Christian profession should be guarded betimes by good instruction against this offence.—To others applies the word of CHRYSOSTOM: Of you also it holds true, that ye have not yet resisted sin unto blood; and well is it, if only that is true, and not rather this: Ye have not yet even despised riches, &c. So much has Christ suffered for us enemies; and we for Him? nothing for Him, but only from Him innumerable benefits.

* [A similar variation marks the Common English rendering of πειρασμός and its cognate verb. Generally, indeed, our Translators use the word *temptation*, but sometimes with the other shade of meaning predominant.—J. L.]

* [This reference is scarcely to the point, since Paul there compares what Divine grace enabled him to do with what was done by the other *Apostles*.—J. L.]

V. 4. To find one's bearings by the word of prophecy—this was a great consolation for the Lord Jesus in His career of suffering (Luke xviii. 31; John xvii. 12; Matt. xxvi. 54); to say nothing, then, of ourselves. For us, when in tribulation, it is indispensable that we know, that so it must be—it was told us before.

V. 5. HEUBNER: The Apostles, like Jesus, did not deceive by empty promises.—Partnership helps to carry the burden. Am I to be my brother's keeper? Not in the sense of a faint-hearted carefulness, as if *we* could guard him, as if he were not in a far better Hand; but, just because we believe this, ought we to be intent in faithful love, as God's fellow-laborers, not to neglect our ministry; to look diligently after our brethren, not to pore in curious speculation; to encourage them by examples and intercession; to hold forth to them the prophetic word; to arouse the remembrance of their own experience of the truth of God; to point them to the gospel of Christ, who, stronger than the strong one [Luke xi. 21 sq.], knows well how to keep faith firm.—HEUBNER: These were church-visitations, where the inquiry was as to the state of the heart.—Even the loving consideration, that, to please their spiritual fathers, they should contend stoutly, may be made available for the strengthening of zeal; there is a sense of honor in the spiritual family.

[Observe the apostolic style of address to individuals and churches, as liable to fall away from their Christian standing and profession.—Faith, the Christian's defence against Satan's devices; comp. Eph. vi. 16; 1 John v. 4.—BURKITT: Though the labor of faithful ministers shall not be in vain with respect to themselves—their reward is with the Lord (the careful nurse shall be paid, though the child dies at the breast)—yet with respect to their people they may be in vain, yea worse, for a testimony against them; Mark vi. 11.—MATTHEW HENRY: Faithful ministers are much concerned about the success of their labors.—J. L.]

CH. III. 6-13.

3. Timothy having brought good tidings, Paul is full of joy and thankfulness to God, to whom he at the same time prays without ceasing, that he may be enabled to come unto them, and supply the deficiencies of their faith.

6 But now, when Timotheus came [But Timothy having just now come, ἄρτι
δὲ ἐλθόντος Τιμοθέου] from you unto us [to us from you, πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν], and
brought us good tidings of your faith and charity [love, ἀγάπην],* and that ye
have good remembrance of us always, desiring greatly [longing][1] to see us, as
7 [even as][2] we also *to see* you; therefore, brethren, we were comforted [for this
cause we were comforted, brethren,][3] over you in all our affliction and distress
8 [distress and affliction][4] by your faith: for now we live, if ye stand fast[5] in the
9 Lord. For what thanks can we render to God again [render to God, τῷ θεῷ
ἀνταποδοῦναι] for you, for all the joy wherewith we joy for your sakes before
10 our God; night and day praying exceedingly [very exceedingly][6] that we might
see [that we may see, εἰς τὸ ἰδεῖν] your face, and might perfect that which is
11 lacking in your faith [and make up the deficiencies of your faith].[7] Now God
Himself and our Father [But may He Himself, our God and Father][8] and our
12 Lord Jesus Christ,[9] direct our way unto you: and the Lord make you [but you,
may the Lord make][10] to increase and abound in love one toward another
[toward one another, εἰς ἀλλήλους], and toward all *men* [all], even as we [we also,
13 καὶ ἡμεῖς] *do* toward you; to the end He may stablish [establish] your hearts
unblamable in holiness before God, even our Father [our God and Father],[11] at
the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ[12] with all His saints [holy ones].[13]

[1] V. 6.—[ἐπιποθοῦντες. Comp. Rom. i. 11; 2 Cor. ix. 14; Phil. i. 8; ii. 26; and the Exegetical Notes, 3.—J. L.]

[2] V. 6.—[καθάπερ, as in ch. ii. 11. The English Version retains the emphasis, as above, at ch. iii. 12; iv. 5; Rom. iv. 6; 2 Cor. i. 14; iii. 18.—J. L.]

[3] V. 7.—[διὰ τοῦτο—as in v. 5—παρεκλήθημεν, ἀδελφοί. Here, as in the preceding verse, and so often elsewhere, the Greek order is quite needlessly changed by our Translators.—J. L.]

[4] V. 7.—Ἀνάγκῃ καὶ θλίψει is given by the oldest authorities [including Sin.], instead of the inverse order. [And so many of the modern editors, including Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth (though he lays stress on the fact that Tertullian, in quoting this Epistle, has *Christi* here, as well as *Christo* at ch. ii. 19), Ellicott.—J. L.]

[5] V. 8.—On the reading στήκετε after ἐάν, comp. Winer, ed. 6, p. 264. The *Sinaiticus*, however, reads στήκητε [*a prima manu*; for there is a correction of it into στήκετε, with A. F. G. &c.—In v. 9, for θεῷ, Sin.[1] reads κυρίῳ with D.[1] F. G., and, for θεοῦ, it has κυρίου.—J. L.]

[6] V. 10.—[ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ = *more than superabundantly;* Webster and Wilkinson: *with more than excess.* Comp. ch. v. 13; Eph. iii. 20.—J. L.]

[7] V. 10.—[καὶ καταρτίσαι τὰ ὑστερήματα τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν. See *Exegetical Notes*, 8.—J. L.]

[8] V. 11.—[Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν. For the double reference of ἡμῶν, see p. 49, Note †; and, for the various constructions of αὐτός, see my *Revision* of this verse, Note a. The above translation corresponds to that of our author: *Er selbst aber, unser Gott und Vater.* Strictly speaking, however, I prefer to regard αὐτός as merely emphasizing ὁ θεὸς—Ἰησοῦς (χριστός), and to make these latter words themselves the immediate compound subject of the verbs.—J. L.].

* [Sin., as B., has ὑμῶν before πίστιν as well as after ἀγάπην.—J. L.]

[9] V. 11.—[Χριστός is wanting in the oldest authorities including Sin. It is bracketed by Schott and Riggenbach, and cancelled by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott.—J. L.]

[10] V. 12.—[ὑμᾶς δὲ ὁ κύριος. *Revision:* "Such is our prayer for ourselves; *but you*, whether we come or not (Bengel: *sive nos veniemus, sive minus*) &c."—J. L.] Only a few scattered authorities here omit κύριος, or add Ἰησοῦς, or change it into θεός.

[11] V. 13.—[As in v. 11.—J. L.]

[12] V. 13.—Here Χριστοῦ is wanting in still more authorities [including Sin., and is rejected by Riggenbach, as well as by Schott, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth, Ellicott.—J. L.]; at the end of the verse some (few; also the *Sinaiticus* [*a prima manu.*—J. L.]) have ἀμήν.

[13] V. 13.—[ἁγίων. See the Exegetical Notes, 12.—J. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. (V. 6.) **But, Timothy having just now,** &c.—Casual, resumed afterwards in διὰ τοῦτο.—Ἄρτι, *just, at present* (Matt. ix. 18; 1 Cor. xvi. 7), is best referred, with GROTIUS, BENGEL, PELT, EWALD, HOFMANN, [ALFORD, WORDSWORTH, WEBSTER and WILKINSON, ELLICOTT in the Commentary; his Translation follows the Common Version.—J. L.] to the participle; the Epistle was written immediately after Timothy's return, and hence the fresh joy and gushing love. DE WETTE and LÜNEMANN [JOWETT] would connect ἄρτι with (the somewhat remote) παρεκλήθημεν, v. 7, thus making the main thought to consist in the prominence given to the consolation in opposition to the sending of Timothy. But we should then be compelled unnecessarily to find an anacoluthon in διὰ τοῦτο. *To us*, that is, Paul; possibly even, Paul and Silas, if the latter had already arrived before Timothy.

2. **And brought us good tidings,** &c.—εὐαγγ., Hebr. בִּשֵּׂר (1 Sam. xxxi. 9, Septuagint); here in its original signification, as at Luke i. 19 of the birth of the Baptist; elsewhere, throughout the New Testament, of the good tidings κατ' ἐξοχήν, the tidings of redemption. The birth of John, moreover, is a part of these tidings of salvation. And here too there is something peculiarly earnest, an expression of his great joy, in the fact that Paul uses this word. It is to him a sort of gospel, a fruit of the gospel in the specific sense, the announcement of a Divine work, when he hears a good account of their faith (the root, without which love were merely a work of nature), and of their love (the fruit, the evidence of the living existence of faith; comprehensive love, as 1 Cor. xiii.; comp. 2 Thess. i. 3). CHRYSOSTOM: So great a good does he consider their confirmation to be. And thus he, the bringer of glad tidings, himself receives the glad tidings of the Divine work, the fruit of his gospel.

3. **And that ye have** (retain) **a good** (a truly loving, thankful, prayerful) **remembrance of us;** that they had thus not even been misled in regard to their teachers (HOFMANN). Not: ye make honorable mention of us (GROTIUS; that were frigid, and would require ποιεῖσθε, LÜNEMANN). This personal interest is connected with the main topic. If they continue in faith and love, the natural result of that is attachment to the Apostle. The πάντοτε, *always*, and so immovably, we most naturally refer to the preceding ἔχετε μνείαν (not, as HOFMANN, to what follows); the further explanation, as to how the remembrance shows itself, is given by ἐπιποθοῦντες: *in that ye earnestly long;* or, if the word is equivalent to the simple verb (KOCH, 252, after FRITZSCHE):* *for this ye long, to see us.* BENGEL: A sign of their good conscience.

4. (V. 7.) **For this cause**—embracing the contents of the participial construction in v. 6; as the Greeks sometimes elsewhere use οὕτως for resumption; **we were comforted over you,** *on your account*,* not superfluous even with διὰ τοῦτο; the persons are named in whom he finds comfort; then special mention is made of that quality of theirs, that is comforting to him: *by your faith* (the medium of the comfort); it was their faith about which he had been anxious. Between the two is a second ἐπί, denoting the situation in which *he* found himself: **in** † (2 Cor. vii. 4) **all,** *our whole;* the distress, taken together as a totality; not: *every*, which would have required πάσῃ without the article. Ἀνάγκη denotes the distress from without, the evil condition; θλῖψις, its inward operation, affliction, anguish.‡ It would be improper to ascribe to the former any special reference to pecuniary need.§ Altogether to be rejected is the idea of anxiety about the Thessalonians; for this would now certainly have been removed; whereas the ἐπί shows that he intends a distress that still continues, but *in* which he was comforted by the faith of the Thessalonians (LÜNEMANN).

5. (V. 8.) **For now we live,** &c.; comp. Ps. xxii. 27 [26. WEBSTER and WILKINSON refer to Gen. xliv. 30; 1 Sam. xviii. 1; Gal. iv. 19]. He thus explains his having been comforted. Life in the full sense, opposed to distress and anguish, which is a death, a dying daily (1 Cor. xv. 31). CALVIN: Here we see, how Paul almost forgot himself for the sake of the Thessalonians. Rom. vii. 9, where he speaks of a death by sin, goes yet deeper. Seldom does Paul use ζῆν of the mere bodily life. **If ye** (emphatic) **stand fast,** remain steadfast; στήκειν, a later verbal form, derived from ἕστηκα, frequently employed by Paul: Rom. xiv. 4; Phil. iv. 1; **in the Lord,** as your life-element, most intimately united to Him, rooted and sheltered in Him. He again employs ἐάν for the future as wanting confirmation; not, however, as doubting them, but merely as a stimulus: It depends on you, to help in preparing for me death or life. Calvin: *Hæc gratulatio vim exhortationis habet.* He thereby precludes all rising of vanity in himself and the Thessalonians; but especially by means of the thanksgiving that follows.—HOFMANN, it is true, finds it impossible that the Apostle should make his present life depend on a condition, the occurrence of which only the future could show. He would therefore refer the words διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν πίστεως to what follows, so that we should have to assume an inversion at ὅτι;—

* [And so likewise ALFORD and ELLICOTT make the ἐπί directive, not intensive.—J. L.]

* [ἐφ' ὑμῖν—the basis of the παράκλησις. SCHOTT, ELLICOTT.—J. L.]

† [German: *bei*. ELLICOTT describes this ἐπί as having what he calls a *semilocal* force, and as carrying the idea of "ethical contact." WEBSTER and WILKINSON: "*with all*. The ideas of succession and coexistence are involved in ἐπί thus used, principally the latter: comfort came after sorrow, but while the sorrow was still felt—came as a remedy or alleviation. Comp. 2 Cor. i. 4, and the exactly parallel circumstances and expressions in 2 Cor. vii. 4-7."—J. L.]

‡ [An altogether untenable distinction. DE WETTE refers both words to the Apostle's inward anxieties; LÜNEMANN (followed by ALFORD and ELLICOTT), to his outward troubles.—J. L.]

§ [A suggestion of MACKNIGHT, and allowed by SCHOTT.—J. L.]

unnecessary, for even in the strongly emphatic νῦν there lies a sufficient expression of the present condition for present life: "*now* (just because ye believe);" * and if the words, in Hofmann's construction of them, support the addition, as to the sense, of: *and shall continue to live, if ye continue to believe*, then so they do also in the ordinary construction. On the whole, Hofmann's division of the clauses in vv. 7–10 is extremely artificial and cumbersome.

6. (V. 9.) **For what thanks,** &c.—Thereby Paul confirms the weighty ζῶμεν [ALFORD: "accounts for, and specifies the action of, the ζωή just mentioned."—J. L.]: What greater blessing could we have, for which to give thanks? The ἀνταποδοῦναι (שִׁלֵּם, Joel iv. [iii., in the English arrangement.—J. L.] 4, Septuagint) marks the thanksgiving as a return, requited for what was received; in 2 Thess. i. 6 it is used of primitive retribution. In the sphere of free, spiritual love it is thanksgiving, Ps. cxvi. 12. For the third time, and this time most emphatically, he expresses his thanks (ch. i. 2; iii. 13); this time also for the ascertained stability of the Thessalonians.—Περί, on your account; ἐπί, on occasion of all the joy (the article marks the joy as a whole), wherewith we joy. [WEBSTER and WILKINSON: he has two subjects of thankfulness, their fidelity, and his own satisfaction therein.—J. L.]; ᾗ by attraction for ἥν, since the accusative should have stood (Matt. ii. 10; Winer, § 32. 2). The dative, indeed, occurs also without attraction, John iii. 29; comp. Luke xxii. 15; WINER, § 54. 3. But in these places the dative of a substantive cognate to the verb goes to strengthen the verbal idea, like the Hebrew infinitive absolute. We might, therefore, rather compare such texts as Acts ii. 30; xvi. 28, where the dative is to be understood instrumentally.—Δἰ ὑμᾶς belongs to χαίρομεν, not to what follows, which is already sufficiently defined; likewise ἔμπροσθεν &c. (before our God, who is ours and we His) still belongs to what precedes; for, referred to what follows, it would make the sentence drag, whereas, connected with χαίρομεν, it is by no means superfluous (EWALD, HOFMANN); rather is the import already given quite correctly by CALVIN: *vere et absque simulatione ulla;* LÜNEMANN: with a pure joy, therefore, to which nothing earthly adheres (ALFORD: one which will bear, and does bear, the searching eye of God, and is *His* joy (John xv. 11.).—J. L.]

7. (V. 10.) **Night and day,** &c.—Comp. ch. ii. 9; as according to that place his manual labor, so according to the present his fervent supplications also (2 Tim. i. 3) are prolonged into the night; **very exceedingly,** above measure exceedingly; a lively Pauline climax (ch. v. 13 (*var.*); Eph. iii. 20 (*var.*); comp. Mark vi. 51).—According to LÜNEMANN [ALFORD: *praying as we do*, ELLICOTT, &c.] the participle δεόμενοι should depend on δυνάμεθα, v. 9. Not only, however, does that lie too far off, but, as regards the sense also, it is little suitable, since that δυνάμ. has an interrogative force, and presupposes the answer: We cannot indeed say what thanks would suffice. LUTHER and VON GERLACH take v. 10 as the answer to v. 9: *What thanks? in that we pray; the thanks*, that is, *that we pray;*—a fair sense, but too artificial. We do better, therefore, to take δεόμ. as in apposition to χαίρομεν (DE WETTE): *wherewith we joy, while we* (at the same time) *unceasingly pray.*

8. **That we may see,** &c.—The object of the prayer is expressed in the form of a purpose: *We pray, in order to see;* as ch. ii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 2.—**Your face,** as ch. ii. 17. Not merely, however, to luxuriate in sensibilities, but with the holy aim of *redressing, supplying, completing;* καταρτίζειν, from ἄρτιος, *integer*, to mend, restore what has been damaged; the nets, Matt. iv. 21; spiritually, 1 Cor. i. 10; Gal. vi. 1; but also to complete what has not been damaged; the creation, Heb. x. 5; xi. 3. Nor in this case is it meant to convey a reproach of degeneracy; synonymous with προσαναπληροῦν, 2 Cor. ix. 12.—Τὰ ὑστερήματα, *the deficiencies*, that wherein one is behindhand; of poverty in external things, 2 Cor. ix. 12; what is still outstanding of sufferings, Col. i. 24. We may distinguish, but not separate, deficiencies in the insight of faith from deficiencies in the power of faith in the life. They need instruction, exhortation, intercession. The ἐάν of v. 8 had already reminded them that no one, so long as he lives in the flesh, must imagine that he stands and cannot fall; ch. iv. shows, that Paul exhorts the Thessalonians in matters of practice, as well as instructs them in those of theory (LÜNEMANN, against OLSHAUSEN).

9. (V. 11.) **But * may He Himself,** &c.—LÜNEMANN: *But may God Himself, our Father*—refers ἡμῶν without reason to πατήρ only [and so ALFORD, ELLICOTT, &c.]. We understand (against DE WETTE) that there is here a contrast with the Apostle, who prays that God Himself would do His work, and that in a twofold respect: 1. when he directs, smooths, expressly guides, *our* way to you (Luke i. 79, the feet; 2 Thess. iii. 5, hearts; comp. Rom. i. 10 [Sept. Ps. v. 8]), only so do we escape from empty places of our own, which Satan thwarts (ch. ii. 18); 2. but you (v. 12), whether we come or not (BENGEL), the Lord alone can duly confirm; we are, indeed, merely instruments for the καταρτίσαι, which proceeds from God.

10. **Our God and Father and our Lord Jesus Christ:** God gives only through Jesus; Christ also is invoked with the Father, comp. 2 Thess. ii. 16 sqq.; 1 Cor. i. 2; the verb in the singular shows, that the two are yet not two, but one Divine essence.†

11. (V. 12.) **But you, may the Lord make,** &c.—Πλεονάσαι and περισσεύσαι, as previously κατευθύναι, are three singulars of the optative aorist active, not infinitives (that would require the accent περισσεῦσαι, and could only be understood as an arbitrary ellipsis); πλεονάζειν occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only as an intransitive, here transitive (like the hiphil), and so in the Septuagint (of things, not persons), Num. xxvi. 54; Ps. lxxi. 21; περισσεύειν, generally intransitive, but also transitive: of things, 2 Cor. ix. 8; and the passive (Matt. xiii. 12) implies a transitive active. So then: *May He make you perfect* ‡ (not: *through increase*

* [ALFORD: νῦν—"implying the fulfilment of the condition (ἐάν) which follows;"—ELLICOTT: "logical and argumentative, approaching in meaning to *in hoc rerum statu, rebus sic se habentibus*"—J. L.]

* [δέ—not simply μεταβατικόν (ELLICOTT: *Now*), but with its proper adversative force: *But*—in spite of all Satan's hindrances, and notwithstanding the failure hitherto of our own repeated attempts and ceaseless longings.—J. L.]

† [ATHANASIUS, *Orat. contra Arianos* III. 11.: τὴν ἑνότητα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐφύλαξεν.—J. L.]

‡ [German: *er mache euch vollkommen;*—a needless departure from the strict meaning of πλεονάσαι, and one not justified by the parenthesis.—J. L.]

of numbers, but, as no doubt connected with that,) *in love* (dative, as in ch. ii. 17), *and richly to abound; toward one another*, therefore in brotherly love (ch. iv. 9), *and toward all* (who are not yet brethren); not merely: *toward all other Christians*, so that the first member should mean only; *toward you Thessalonians one with another;* still less is the second member merely epexegetical: *and that indeed all* (Thessalonians). A groundless narrowing of the comprehensive sense.—**Even as we also do toward you.** Since the word is *ἡμεῖς*, not *ἡμᾶς*, we cannot supply an optative, but only *περισσεύομεν* (intransitive) *τῇ ἀγάπῃ*. (GROTIUS: *ἐσμέν*.) We are in fact your model, as was said already, ch. i. 6; ii. 10; and that (HOFMANN) in love even to those who are not yet brethren; otherwise, indeed, we should not have come to you. Had we not loved you, before you were Christians, you would never have become such.

12. (V. 13.) **To the end He,** &c.—The final aim and effect of being perfected in love is the establishment of the heart; to become unblamable is the result of the *στηρίζειν*; on the day, not to the day, because the end is regarded as attained; breviloquence, for *εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἀμέμπτους*, 1 Cor. i. 8, and often. WINER, § 66. 3. The negative (*ἀμ.*) stands in the positive: *in holiness* (belongs to *ἀμέμπτους*). That should be the issue with the Thessalonians, as with the Apostle (ch. ii. 10). Holiness, the result of sanctification (ch. iv. 3), comprehends the whole life in and from the Spirit. The unblamableness in holiness has place *before* God's scrutinizing glance *at* the coming of the Lord Jesus. *Μετά* &c. leans closely on *παρουσίᾳ*; it does not belong to the more remote *ἀμέμπτους*. Therefore: when He comes (*πάρεστι*) with all His holy ones; His, Acts ix. 13, that is, Christ's (not, as LÜNEMANN would have it, contrary to the arrangement of the words, God's). In that lies the stimulus: see to it, that ye come along with them.—But who are the *ἅγιοι*? The angels, *His* angels, are Christ's attendants at the judgment (Matt. xxv. 31; xiii. 41; xvi. 27; 2 Thess. i. 7); they are called in the Old Testament קְדשִׁים, Septuagint simply *ἅγιοι*, Ps. lxxxix. 6 [5] (?); Dan. iv. 10 [13]; viii. 13; at Zech. xiv. 5 it might be doubted whether angels *only* are meant. In the New Testament, on the contrary, *ἅγιοι* without any addition never elsewhere denotes the angels, always Christians, Col. iii. 12, and how often! At Col. i. 26 one might possibly (comp. Eph. iii. 10) think of holy men and angels together. But do holy men come *with* the Lord? Rather, *to* Him, to meet Him (ch. iv. 16, 17), says PELT. In the meanwhile, however, they are with Him immediately after death (Phil. i. 23; 2 Cor. v. 8), and He will bring them with Himself (ch. iv. 14); rising before the living [before the rapture of the living.—J. L.], they may be described as coming with Him [caught up to meet the Lord in the air, they then *do* come with Him.—J. L.]; and with this must be compared 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3; xv. 23, 52; 2 Thess. i. 10. Thus, in favor of the reference to the angels (DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN, and others) is what is said of them elsewhere, and the Old Testament phraseology; against it is that of the New Testament (on which account VON GERLACH, HOFMANN and others, understand by the word the sleeping believers). We should then perhaps have to suppose, that the style of Daniel prevails in our Epistle, as likewise in 2 Thess. ii.—BENGEL and STARKE [ALFORD, ELLICOTT, WEBSTER and WILKINSON, &c.] understand by *ἁγίων* angels and glorified men *together*, and in favor of this very view reference might be made to Daniel, where besides angels men also, members of the people of God, who take the kingdom, are called קַדִּישִׁין (ch. vii. 18, 22). Moreover, Heb. xii. 22, 23 puts the angels in company with the Church of the perfected first-born, who indeed have become *ἰσάγγελοι*. (Luke xx. 36). The Lord is Head of the Church, as of principalities and powers (Eph., Col.).—*Ἀμήν*, which is added by A. D.[1] E. Sin. It. Vulg., suits the devotional strain, but for that very reason may have been of liturgical origin, or added by the copyist.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. (V. 6.) Faithfulness to the gospel is naturally connected with thankful love to those who publish it. Roos: It is well, when after some time matters stand thus between teachers and their former hearers, whose spiritual fathers they are. Backsliders cannot think kindly of their former spiritual fathers, and have no longing desire to see them again, since shame and fear, or even a malignant bitterness, do preclude this.—The Apostle is far from fostering a false dependence, that leans on men rather than on the Lord Himself (1 Cor. i. 13 sqq.; iii. 4 sqq.). When a separation is necessary to a proper independence, the Lord brings it about for the upright in due time.

[BURKITT: Christian love doth earnestly long to evidence itself in Christian fellowship, and passionately desire the communion of saints, for the mutual comfort and spiritual advantage of each other.—J. L.]

2. (V. 7.) A man of faith, like Paul, needs comfort, and says so without disguise (Rom. i. 10); he takes no such high stand, as if he had no need of it. We scarcely form to ourselves an adequate idea of the agony of his soul for all his churches, and easily mistake in thinking generally of highly endowed and advanced Christians, forgetting that in the conflict they are most exposed and harassed.

3. In v. 7 Paul speaks only of the faith of the Thessalonians, the root; whereas at v. 12, the root being firm, his desire is turned simply to their increase in love, that expression of faith in the life, whose growth then again reacts to the strengthening of faith. Happy he, to whom the faith of others is a comfort, that enables him to disregard, yea, to vanquish, his own troubles. Only then, indeed, is there life (v. 8) full, blessed, worthy of the name, when such love finds its occasions of thankfulness.

4. (V. 10.) What we could not allow grammatically, that the prayer is the answer to the question, What thanks can we render? is yet perfectly true in reality. Prayer is the chief part of thanksgiving (*Heidelberg Catechism*, Qu. 116), according to the riches, that is, of God's goodness, which we honor by receiving out of its fulness grace for grace. Supplication is thus thanksgiving, and leads to thankfulness for what has been already received, as on the other hand thanksgiving is supplication for the continuance of the blessing, and impels to further and unceasing supplication.

5. Paul has to touch on the deficiencies of the Thessalonians; and how affectionately does he do so; with as much fatherly frankness as tenderness, and in a manner remote from all pedantry; *not until* he has testified his greatest joy. And they certainly agree with him—are in this also sensible

of his pure love—say not: Have we any deficiencies?—STÄHELIN: A true faith is still always defective. Frequently there is wanting a really convincing knowledge, whence doubts afterwards arise; frequently an assurance of the truth and sincerity of faith, and this arouses a struggle of self-denial; frequently growth in the same, when for many reasons a man is compelled for a long time to exercise himself in expedients alone; frequently the strength to do all things duly in faith. Through the word and prayer these deficiencies are supplied.—BERLENBURGER BIBEL: Faith is a thing that can (and should) grow. We are not to stand still and become careless, as if we thought: Now the Church is planted. For the Church has enemies, and those planted are still novices.

6. (V. 11.) That, even when the matter on hand concerns the promotion of outward arrangements, as of a missionary journey, Jesus also is invoked, though not so prominently, almost exclusively, as the Saviour is among the Moravians,—this shows how the Apostles understand Matt. xxviii. [18]: *all* power in heaven and in earth. Not merely, therefore, in the heart, by means of the truth; that were to be a Prophet without being King. But this can be nothing else but the return of the glory, which He had before the world was (John xvii. 5). The Socinian theory, favored also by later writers, of the glorification, deification, of a man, who was not God from the beginning, is irreconcilable therewith. GESS: If for God to become man is something miraculous, for a man to become God is something monstrous. To make a creature Mediator between God and the creatures is to change the Mediator into a partition wall. If New Testament believers are not to be put in a lower position than those of the Old Testament, who depended on Jehovah Himself,* then must Jesus *not* be a mere man.

7. The Apostle's desire and prayer was first granted years after (Acts xx.). How much higher, then, truly are God's thoughts than even an Apostle's thoughts, and His ways higher than an Apostle's ways! His object, the confirmation of the Thessalonians, was attained through other means, especially even by means of his letters.

8. (V. 12.) Brotherly love and universal love are concentric circles—the centre, Christ. The narrower circle is not an occasion of bigoted exclusiveness, but a focus of refreshment for the wider one (2 Pet. i. 7). All, indeed, are called to be brethren. Between such as are so already, and such as have yet to become so, there exists before God an essential difference; before the eyes of men the transition is often imperceptible; no guild; no see here, see there. Where *God* really fills the heart, there also does love. But God only can give proficiency in this fulfilling of the law, as well as a beginning in it. He requires from us what exceeds our powers, that we may learn to obtain from Him by prayer the power to perform it (CALVIN). To become perfect in love imparts to the heart a steadfastness in willing nothing that is contrary to the will of God, Rom. xiii. 8, 10 (HOFMANN).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

V. 6. CHRYSOSTOM: Who is like Paul, who regards the salvation of his neighbors as his own, feeling toward all as the body toward its members?—RIEGER: What love to the sheep, that good news of them could so vivify him!—DIEDRICH: So does the shepherd's love identify him with the flock. This is the difference between the shepherd and the hireling.—Jacob revives on hearing that Joseph is alive; still more blessed is his joy, who has a faculty for bearing good in the highest sense of another (3 John 4; Luke xv. 7).

CHRYSOSTOM: Hear, how scholars are admired, who have a good remembrance of their teachers; how they are esteemed happy!—RIEGER: The Apostle regards the remembrance of him and the longing after him as in themselves good impulses, and as a proof of the value which they put on the gospel, and so likewise on strenuous laborers therein.

Vv. 7, 8. HEUBNER: The steadfastness of others strengthens ourselves.—In God's gift and work we find life. Without that, it deserves not the name.—SENECA: *Etiam in longissima vita minimum est, quod vivitur.*—[The spiritual welfare of the Church, and the strength and joy of her ministers, alike depend on the Church's faith.—J. L.]

V. 9. We cannot sufficiently give thanks! It were often more true to say: We do not sufficiently give thanks, even as we might. God's kindnesses, however, are in any case greater than that we should be able to repay them.—[MATTHEW HENRY: When we are most cheerful, we should be most thankful. What we rejoice *in*, we should give thanks *for*.—ADAM CLARKE: How near his heart did the success of his ministry lie!—J. L.]

V. 10. The calm collecting of holy thoughts in the night season—intercessory prayer in times of sleeplessness—is a good imitation of the Apostle.

HEUBNER: The more prosperous the beginning, with so much the greater zeal prosecute the work.—Along with joy over a good condition, two things are always needed to save us from falling into conceit, ostentation, presumption, self-sufficiency, and vain glorying in men: that the honor be given to God, and that we do not lose the recollection of actual deficiencies.—CALVIN: Even those, who are far ahead of others, are still far from having reached the goal.—No standing still; faith would be, not merely once established, but ever newly cherished and promoted.—[MATTHEW HENRY: When we are most thankful, we should also *give ourselves to prayer;* and those we *give thanks for*, yet have need to be *prayed for*.—J. L.]

V. 11. The Apostle's fervent spirit overflows in prayer, not merely in his chamber, but in the Epistle itself.

HEUBNER: All our steps and ways are in God's hand; to everything He must give His consent (Gen. xxiv. 40; Jer. x. 23; James iv. 13-15).—[To commit our way unto the Lord, the grand secret of a safe, contented, happy, and truly prosperous life.—J. L.]

V. 12.—HEUBNER: Love should not be scanty, poor, but rich, exuberant.—CHRYSOSTOM: Love after God's kind embraces all. If thou lovest this man, and that man not at all, this is nothing but a friendship after a human sort.—[MATTHEW HENRY: We are beholden to God not only for the *stock* put into our hands at first, but for the *improvement* of it also.—The more we are beloved, the more loving we should be.—J. L.]

V. 13. ROOS: Establishment of the heart comes through growth in holiness, and this consists especially in love.—CHRYSOSTOM: By it the heart be

* [But not without the blood of sacrifice, and priestly intercession, and both as types of Him who was to come.—J. L.]

comes unblamable, from which otherwise proceed evil thoughts, that cannot be there without outward act. There is no sin that is not consumed by the power of love, as by fire.—Love, feeding on the hope of heaven (Col. i. 4, 5), can only confirm, not prejudice, the salvation of souls.—[BENSON: *Before God*—it is a small matter to be accounted holy *among men*.—J. L.]

SECOND PART.

DIDACTIC AND HORTATORY.

CH. IV., V.

I.

Warning against Fornication and Covetousness.

CH. IV. 1–8.

1 Furthermore, then, we beseech you, brethren, and exhort *you* [Finally then,
brethren, we beseech you, and exhort][1] by [in, ἐν] the Lord Jesus, that,[2] as ye
have received of [according as ye received from][3] us how ye ought to walk
and to please God, [even as also ye do walk,][4] *so* ye would abound more and
2 more [ye would abound yet more].[5] For ye know what commandments we gave
3 you by the Lord Jesus. For this is the will of God, *even* your sanctification
[God's will, your sanct., ϑέλημα τοῦ ϑεοῦ, ὁ ἁγιασμὸς ὑμῶν]; that ye should abstain
4 [ye abstain] from fornication; that every one of you should know how to possess his vessel [every one of you know how to possess himself of his own v.][6]
5 in sanctification and honor, not in the lust of concupiscence [in passion of lust,
ἐν πάϑει ἐπιϑυμίας], even as the [also the, καί τά] Gentiles which [who] know not
6 God; that no *man* [one] go beyond and defraud his brother in *any* matter [in
the matter his brother, ἐν τῷ πράγματι τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ]: because that the Lord
is the avenger of all such [an avenger for all these things, ἔκδικος . . . περὶ
πάντων τούτων], as [even as, καϑώς] we also have forewarned [also told you
7 before][7] and testified [fully testified].[8] For God hath not called [did not call,
οὐ . . . ἐκάλεσεν] us unto uncleanness, but unto holiness [for uncleanness, but in
8 sanctification].[9] He therefore [Wherefore then he][10] that despiseth, despiseth
[rejecteth, rejecteth][11] not man, but God, who hath also given [also gave][12] unto
us His Holy Spirit [His Holy Spirit unto you].[13]

[1] V. 1.—[Τὸ λοιπὸν (comp. E. V. 2 Thess. iii. 1; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Eph. vi. 10; Phil. iii. 1; iv. 8, and see Exegetical Notes, 1. In this case nearly all the uncial manuscripts, including Sin., and modern editors omit the τό, as at 2 Cor. xiii. 11) οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἐρωτῶμεν ὑμᾶς καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν.—J. L.]

[2] V. 1.—B. D.[1] and others give ἵνα καθώς, and resume at the end of the verse: ἵνα περισσ. [Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott].—Sin. A. and others omit the first ἵνα.

[3] V. 1.—[καθὼς παρελάβετε (when we were with you) παρά.—J. L.]

[4] V. 1.—Καθὼς καὶ περιπατεῖτε is given by a large number of the oldest authorities [Sin. A. B. D. E. F. G., Vulgate, &c.; and so Wells, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth, Ellicott, Am. Bible Union.—J. L.]; it was probably omitted as cumbrous.

[5] V. 1.—[περισσεύητε μᾶλλον. German: *noch mehr;* Wakefield, Conybeare at v. 10, Ellicott: *still more;* Sharpe, Alford: *yet more.*—In v. 2, for ἐδώκαμεν, Sin. reads δεδώκ., with one or two cursives.—J. L.]

[6] V. 4.—[εἰδέναι ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σκεῦος κτᾶσθαι. See the Exegetical Notes, 3.—Sin.[1] repeats ἐν before τιμῇ.—J. L.]

[7] V. 6.—[καὶ προείπαμεν—again referring to the time of his personal ministry at Thessalonica.—The form of the second aorist, προειπ ο μεν is given by Griesbach, Scholz, Ellicott* (?).—J. L.]

[8] V. 6.—[διεμαρτυράμεθα. The διά is recognized as intensive by many of the commentaries and versions. Beza *asseveranter;* Benson, Ellicott: *solemnly;* Macknight, Peile: *fully;* Alford: *constantly;* &c.—The ὁ before κύριος in this verse is wanting in Sin.[1] A. B. D.,[1] and is cancelled by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott.—J. L.]

[9] V. 7.—[ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἐν ἁγιασμῷ. See the Exegetical Notes, 5.—J. L.]

[10] V. 8.—[So Macknight and Ellicott render τοιγαροῦν ὁ. Comp. the E. V. at Heb. xii. 1—the only other instance of τοιγαροῦν.—J. L.]

[11] V. 8.—[In both cases ἀθετῶν; for which Erasmus and other Latin versions here change the *spernit* of the Vulgate into *rejicit* or *repudiat*, as many German versions (though not Riggenbach's) do Luther's *verachtet* into *verwirft.* The

* [So at least in the text of the American reprint. But, as the Commentary gives the first aorist,—αμεν, this is perhaps one of the too numerous errors in these otherwise comely editions of ELLICOTT.—J. L.]

R. V. marginal *rejecteth* is preferred by several English translators, including Alford, in the Commentary, Ellicott, and the Am. Bible Union.—J. L.]

[12] V. 8.—The authorities are divided between δόντα [the *lect. rec.*, retained by nearly all the editors, after A. K. L.* and διδόντα [Lachmann, after Sin.[1] B. D. E. F. G.], both with or [Lachmann] without καί.

[13] V. 8.—[τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ τὸ ἅγιον εἰς ὑμᾶς.] The preponderance of authority is for ὑμᾶς [Sin. B. D. E. F. G. &c. the Syriac and other versions] instead of ἡμᾶς [A., Vulgate, &c.—Almost all the critical editions have ὑμᾶς.—J. L.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. (Vv. 1, 2.) **Finally.**—*Λοιπόν* (for which the evidence here preponderates, comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 10), not materially different from *τὸ λοιπόν*, 2 Thess. iii. 1; Phil. iv. 8 is used either with a temporal meaning: *henceforth, now* (Matt. xxvi. 45), or in the sense of *moreover;* but not, as CHRYSOSTOM explains it: *evermore*. In the second signification it introduces the close of the discourse; GROTIUS: *locutio properantis ad finem*. That is the case even here; from what is personal Paul turns to the closing exhortation, which indeed is prolonged.* He advances from wishing to exhorting (Roos). That they may become unblamable (ch. iii. 13; with which the *οὖν* forms an immediate connection), he beseeches and exhorts in those particulars, in which there is yet room for improvement in the deficiencies of their faith; thus letting the *καταρτίσαι* begin meanwhile by letter, first in vv. 1–12 in reference to their walk, then in vv. 13 sqq. in reference to their knowledge. In the classics *ἐρωτᾷν* means only *to ask a question*, but in the Septuagint it already stands for שָׁאַל (Ps. cxxii. 6), and in the New Testament it often means *to beseech* (2 Thess. ii. 1).—**And exhort,** by virtue of apostolic authority; but the *evangelical exhortation* is a friendly entreaty, which respects freedom. The entreaty and the exhortation are exercised in the Lord Jesus; the fellowship of His life is the element (2 Cor. ii. 17); the Apostle acts as Christ's organ: he reckons not himself sufficiently worthy even to beseech or exhort. The object of the exhortation is marked substantively by *τό* (Luke xxii. 23, 24; Rom. viii. 26; WINER, § 18. 3). The aim of the walk is *to please God* (as the Apostle pleases Him, ch. ii. 4). [WEBSTER and WILKINSON: "Θεῷ without art., such a being as God is."—J. L.]—**Even as also ye do** (actually) **walk,** recognizes what they already are; and this is implied also in the *μᾶλλον*: *yet more* (than you now do) should you become rich and abound (here intransitive)† therein. But not: You are to do more than is commanded.—**For,** confirms the exhortation by an appeal to their own knowledge of what commandments (1 Tim. i. 5, 18; the verb at v. 11 and 2 Thess. iii. 4) they had received (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 1; Gal. iv. 13).—**By the Lord Jesus,** is not quite equivalent to *ἐν* of v. 1; we might have expected him to say: *Jesus gave them by us;* but he says on the contrary: *We gave them by Him* the Mediator of all truth and all authority; not δι' ἐμαυτοῦ did I command; comp. Rom. xv. 30. Synonymous with *ἐν ὀνόματι*, 2 Thess. iii. 6; *διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος*, 1 Cor. i. 10.

2. (V. 3.) **For this is God's will,** &c. (ch. v. 18); [WEBSTER and WILKINSON: "The art. with Θεοῦ draws attention to the circumstance that God had just been spoken of as one to whose will it should be our main object to conform, 'our God,' the God we serve."—J. L.]; with this begins the special detail of the *παραγγελίαι*. The subject is *τοῦτο*; the predicate *θέλημα* (according to the best authorities, without the article). What follows does not embrace the entire will of God on all its sides; *multæ sunt voluntates*, Acts xiii. 22; BENGEL.*—In apposition to *τοῦτο*,† and substantially the subject of the statement, is *ὁ ἁγιασμός*, which differs from *ἁγιωσύνη*, ch. iii. 13, in that the latter denotes the religious and moral character, but *ἁγιασμός* the religious and moral process, the work of sanctification. Not materially different is HOFMANN'S view, according to which *ὁ ἁγ.* were merely appositional (to *θέλημα*?), and the proper definition of the *τοῦτο* would be first given by the following infinitives. In our Epistle Paul has as yet no occasion, as in Rom. iii.–vi., to develop, in polemic opposition to Jewish legality, justification as the basis of sanctification; nor is that the case in the Corinthian Epistles; Paul has no set form; but the soul of his thought and action is this: "By the grace of God I am what I am" (1 Cor. xv. 10). OLSHAUSEN, like some of the older interpreters, would understand *ἁγ.* as opposed to the immediately following *πορνεία*, in the special sense of chastity. But that is *ἁγνεία*. Not even in Rom. vi. 19; 1 Tim. ii. 15, is the narrower sense found. And *ἀκαθαρσία* likewise, v. 7, is more comprehensive, including also covetousness, as in ch. ii. 3, 5. Though *γάρ* of v. 7 shows indeed that v. 6 must come under the contrast between uncleanness and sanctification, yet it does not at all follow from that, that the idea of the former is here limited to unchastity (see on v. 6). Rather, abstinence from fornication is merely one (chief) instance of the sanctification which he recommends.

3. (Vv. 3–5.) **That ye abstain,** &c.—The (accusative with) infinitive is epexegetical or appositional to *ἁγιασμός*. On the subduing of fornication, comp. 1 Cor. vi. and vii. CHRYSOSTOM: When he says, "from *all* fornication," he leaves it to those who know, to think of the various kinds of lewdness. With the negative Paul couples the positive in the form of a coördinate accusative with infinitive: **that every one of you know,** *εἰδέναι* as *scire, understand how to, be able to*—(we only properly know, what we can also do)—**acquire, get,**‡ not *possess*, which must have been expressed by the perfect *κεκτῆσθαι*; no other tense means *to possess*, not even Sir. vi. 7; li. 20. By *σκεῦος*, however, *vessel, utensil, tool,* כְּלִי, some (TERTULLIAN, CHRYSOSTOM [and the other more eminent Greek commentators, THEODORET, THEOPHYLACT, ŒCUMENIUS.—J. L.], CALVIN, GROTIUS [Bishops HALL and WILSON,

* [VAUGHAN: "Literally, *As a remaining thing:* marking an approach towards the conclusion of the Epistle, but not necessarily a very near approach."—WEBSTER and WILKINSON: τὸ λοιπὸν οὖν, "Now then, what else I have to say is"; λοιπόν, "Let me say further."—J. L.]

† [περισσεύητε—contrasted with the transitive περισσεύσαι of ch. iii. 12.—J. L.]

* [ELLICOTT would explain the absence of the article simply by reference to the substantive verb preceding.—J. L.]

† [ELLICOTT [after ALFORD] says, "to the preceding θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ." But his previous remark, that one reason why τοῦτο, the subject, is placed somewhat emphatically forward is, that it may "direct the reader's attention to the noun in apposition that follows," naturally suggests the other and, I think, better view.—J. L.]

‡ [German: *erwerben*, for *κτᾶσθαι*. JOWETT and ELLICOTT: *get himself*. In the *Revision* I suggested: *possess himself of*—a phrase which Vaughan has adopted. WORDSWORTH: "*acquire* and *hold;*" WEBSTER and WILKINSON: *secure the possession of*.—J. L.]

HAMMOND, WHITBY, &c.—J. L.], BENGEL, OLSHAUSEN, PELT [WORDSWORTH, WEBSTER and WILKINSON]* understand the *body;* others (THEODORE of Mopsuestia, AUGUSTINE, THOMAS AQUINAS, ZWINGLI, WETSTEIN, SCHOTT, DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN, EWALD, HOFMANN [JOWETT, ALFORD, ELLICOTT]),† the *wife.* The former say that Scripture in still other places speaks of the body in this sense—does not treat it contemptuously as the prison of the soul—recognizes indeed the trouble that it makes for us as the seat, not the origin, of sin—but requires that it stand in the Lord's service as a sanctified organ of the Spirit (1 Cor. vi. 13); comp. 2 Cor. iv. 7 (where, it is true, the epithet ὀστράκινα is not to be overlooked); the Rabbins, moreover, use כלי of the body; Philo says repeatedly: τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγγεῖον τὸ σῶμα; Barnabas, 7. 11: σκεῦος τοῦ πνεύματος; but also, ch. 21, simply: τὸ καλὸν σκεῦος. In our text ἑαυτοῦ might, if necessary, take the place of πνεύματος. But how does κτᾶσθαι, *to get, to obtain,* suit with this? For *to possess* is not the meaning of the word, but *acquirere*—an argument already employed by WETSTEIN. Accordingly κτᾶσθαι would have to signify *to get the mastery over;* CHRYSOSTOM: Only through sanctification do we gain the body for a σκεῦος; sin, on the contrary, gains it, when we are impure. As this is of itself somewhat artificial, so it is entirely at variance (DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN [KOCH, ALFORD, ELLICOTT]) with the fact, that to κτᾶσθαι really belongs also the negative definition (v. 5), μὴ ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίας (the genitive as in ch. i. 3; passion peculiar to lust, concupiscence; ἐπιθ. is the natural element of sin (Rom. vii. 7), which swells to passion; comp. πάθη ἀτιμίας, Rom. i. 24, 26). So then: *You are to acquire the σκεῦος in sanctification, not in passionate lust;* this does not suit the assumed meaning of σκεῦος; for, in truth, it is *only* by sanctification that the mastery over the body is gained; by lust comes the opposite, the loss of the mastery. *Gain the mastery over the body, not in passion,* were to give an absurd turn to the prohibition.‡

We are thus driven to the other explanation, for which, it is true, Scripture furnishes as little as for the first any perfectly exact parallel. For passages where man is described generally as a figure of clay (Is. xlv. 9, and often), or expressions as σκεύη ἐλέους, Rom. ix. 23, and such like, are too dissimilar. The one that comes nearest seems to be 1 Pet. iii. 7; but even there the wife is described as the weaker vessel, to wit of the Divine grace, merely in the relation of contrast, over against the stronger vessel, but not as the vessel or instrument of the man. Among the Rabbins, however, the latter idea is found (with the blunt explanation: *cui immittitur semen*): *vas meum quo ego utor,* Megill. Esth. 1. 11; and, besides, κτᾶσθαι is used of taking a wife (Ruth iv. 10, Septuagint; Sir. xxxvi. 29 [24]).

It is objected, 1. that this would be to speak too meanly of the wife, as of a dependent instrument of the man, contrary to the reciprocity of 1 Cor. vii. 4; 2. that the opposition to πορν. would be taken somewhat too narrowly, especially if we understand the matter thus: *You are to contract marriage in sanctification, not in lust;* in this way the exhortation would be, not for such as still remain single, or for widowers, and for others, even only in regard to the formation of the marriage tie; 3. (a point made by OLSHAUSEN, and also by CALVIN before him), that the exhortation would thus not at all apply to the woman. It may be replied (with DE WETTE and LÜNEMANN), 1. that the wife is not in every respect viewed as the instrument of the man, but only in the special relation suggested by the opposition to πορν. Keep yourselves from *vaga libido;* procure rather every one his own instrument, to wit, for the instinct in question, not as one in πορν. procures a σκεῦος, not his own, in passionate lust. Here, as in 1 Cor. vii., Paul speaks plainly and undisguisedly, but yet briefly and decently. 2. This exhortation is generally applicable; that is to say, those who do not possess the gift of continence (1 Cor. vii. 2, 9) are, for the sake of avoiding πορν., to take to themselves every one his own regular wife (if they are still single or widowers), and not use a σκεῦος that is not their own; but neither are they to marry in a merely fleshly way, and just so they are not to lead their married life in that spirit. It concerns both the formation of the marriage relation and the subsequent life therein, when it is said: Obtain your σκεῦος (at first and ever afterwards) in sanctification and honor. 3. This exhortation Paul directs with perfect propriety to the men as the specially active parties, who readily allow themselves greater liberty in this thing. The inference as regards Christian women was self-evident.

LÜNEMANN thinks that *in sanctification and honor* is merely an explanation of what is implied in the expression, *his own vessel.* But the sense is richer, if we thus distinguish: 1. Let every one acquire his own vessel, and that, indeed, 2. in the proper way, as it should be acquired (and then also kept accordingly). It is not enough that one *have* a wife; it is likewise important, *in what way* he has got and now holds her. "For a man may be drunk even on his own wines." The proper mode of the κτᾶσθαι is therefore described: *in sanctification* inwardly, before God, so that there is an imitation of the love of Christ (Eph. v.) and a mutual furtherance in the service of God and in the rule of the spirit; whence follows in the relation between man and man: *and in honor* (Col. ii. 23; 1 Pet. iii. 7); in maintaining one's own honor, and in the respect or manifestation of honor that is shown to the wife; as opposed to the ἀτιμία of him who sinks himself below the beasts, desecrating and degrading the σκεῦος by a sinful abuse through παθ. ἐπιθ. in fornication, or even in carnal excesses within the limits of marriage.

Even as also the Gentiles; καί in comparisons, v. 13; Rom. iv. 6; ἔθνη, as frequently for ἐθνικοί.

4. (V. 6). **That no one go beyond, &c.,** is added by asyndeton, with this variation, that now τό stands with the infinitive. Τὸ μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν

* [I should say, a majority of all the commentators.—J. L.]

† [ELLICOTT: "and apparently the majority of recent expositors." Most of the older commentators go the other way.—J. L.]

‡ [I must still question whether the above argument, however plausible, is quite as demonstrative, as has been supposed. As I remarked in the *Revision:* "If the writer really meant to say: 'Instead of serving divers lusts and pleasures (Tit. iii. 3, δουλεύοντες ἐπιθυμίαις κτλ.), and thus making the body your tyrant (Rom. xvi. 18; 2 Pet. ii. 19) and your God (Phil. iii. 19), let every one of you *seek to get possession* and control of it, in a holy and honorable use, not in a vile abuse,' it does not appear that such a construction would be in any respect more harsh and difficult than what is often met with; *e. g.* Rom. iii. 8; 1 John iii. 12." Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 27. JOWETT: "The words ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίας, though forming an antithesis to ἐν ἁγιασμῷ καὶ τιμῇ, need not necessarily, when applied to the heathen, carry us back to κτᾶσθαι τὸ σκεῦος. In v. 5 these latter words are lost sight of, and some general idea gathered from them, such as 'living' ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίας."—J. L.]

cannot depend on εἰδέναι; if on account of the article it could not be parallel to ἀπέχεσθαι and εἰδέναι, then neither is it parallel to κτᾶσθαι, which without the article depends on εἰδέναι. BENGEL sees in the asyndeton a proof that Paul is proceeding with the same topic, the τό bringing confirmation and climax to what was last said. It is, on the whole, supposed by many (CHRYSOSTOM: *the subversion of marriage is worse than the robbery of treasures*, JEROME, ERASMUS [Bishop WILSON], WETSTEIN, OLSHAUSEN, PELT, VON GERLACH [JOWETT, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, VAUGHAN, WORDSWORTH, WEBSTER and WILKINSON, and most others]), that πλεονεκτεῖν (*to overreach, injure*) stands here, not in its ordinary meaning, but figuratively of violated marriage, as Prov. vi. 29–32 compares the thief and the adulterer (that, however, is not to describe the adulterer figuratively as a thief); comp. 2 Sam. xii. (but that is an express parable), and the tenth commandment (of the Reformed division),* which embraces both kinds of sins. Paul (they think), having said before that fornication is contrary to sanctification, and therefore to God, now goes on to say that it wounds also brotherly love—is, so to speak, a greedy grasping at conjugal property, an injury to the rights of a brother. The specification, ἐν τῷ πράγματι, would then be used euphemistically: "in *the* matter" (that mentioned in vv. 4, 5; 2 Cor. vii. 11). On any other view, it is thought, there would be a quite abrupt introduction by asyndeton of a new subject, whereas even the γάρ of v. 7 shows that v. 6 speaks of the uncleanness of lewdness.

Against the last remark, see Exeg. Note 2 (on v. 3); ἀκαθαρσία is *all* impurity of the natural man, the dominion of the flesh over against the spirit; covetousness also belongs to it. On the other hand, there is no example (for a parable like that of Nathan is not one) of the asserted figurative use of πλεονεκτεῖν; and even the asyndeton does not prove what these interpreters wish. Indeed, closely viewed, something even false would be the result of this. That is to say, were τὸ μή &c. of v. 6 merely appositional to vv. 4, 5—if nothing but a new side of πορνεία were to come out of it—then the adulterous πλεονεξία must be a characteristic of *all* πορνεία; a man, in other words, must thereby invade the rights of his brethren; which yet is not the case, for there is many an instance of πορν., which violates no brother's right of possession; that is the case only in a single definite relation, and must consequently have been mentioned as something new, not simply as an apposition to what precedes. Even LÜNEMANN is here too punctilious, when on account of the τό he would take μὴ ὑπερβ. as coördinate, not with ἀπέχ. and εἰδέναι, but with ὁ ἁγιασμός: The will of God is 1. your sanctification, abstinence from fornication, and so forth; and 2. the μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν. But in this way there results the awkwardness of understanding ἁγιασμός of v. 3 in the narrower sense of chastity, whereas in v. 7 it is understood by LÜNEMANN himself (who takes v. 6 as an exhortation against covetousness) in the wider sense. We cannot be driven to this by that article.

Even if we had to acknowledge in this a slight ruggedness of style, we should yet say with HOFMANN, that the very article shows that something new, and of a different nature, now comes in. The difficulty disappears, as soon as (in reading) we punctuate somewhat more strongly after ἁγιασμὸς ὑμῶν, and again after μὴ εἰδότα τὸν θεόν. Thus (with ORIGEN, CALVIN, ZWINGLI, GROTIUS, DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN, EWALD, HOFMANN, and others) we recognize in v. 6 a new exhortation to a second evidence of sanctification (along with chastity as the first) in honesty of dealing, instead of a reckless and covetous overreaching. Many take ὑπερβαίνειν absolutely, without an object, *modum excedere;* LUTHER: *to grasp too far;* Il. 9. 501; PLATO, *Rep.* 366. A But since the one τὸ μή takes the two verbs close together, we shall do better by referring also, with HOFMANN, the addition ἐν τῷ πρ. and the object to both verbs; and then ὑπερβ., *to go beyond*, is the same thing as *to take no notice of*, recklessly *to disregard;* in what? even in πλεονεξία, the desire to have more. The verb is transitive also in 2 Cor. xii. 17, 18; τῷ enclitic, for τινι, as GROTIUS explains it, is not according to New Testament use—not even in 1 Cor. xv. 8; ἐν τῷ πρ. means: in *the* business (Rom. xvi. 2), or even lawsuit (1 Cor. vi. 1), on hand at any particular time.*

His brother—is this to be understood of *brother* in the widest sense, as equivalent to πλησίον? That, however, is contrary to the usage. Even אָח denotes a member of the people of God. But should the limitation, as in Deut. xxiii. 19 sq., indicate a difference in the treatment of brethren and of strangers? By no means; it does not consist with the context, that those who are not brethren should be otherwise treated (comp. ch. iii. 12); Paul, looking simply at the intercourse of Christians with one another, requires that the same should be fraternal, and he uses the name of brother as an argument against unbrotherly overreaching; *ætiologia fugiendæ transgressionis*, BENGEL; just as in 1 Cor. vi., where in like manner the transition from fornication (ch. v.) to covetousness is by asyndeton, hurried and abrupt. In other places also Paul puts close together *these* two capital vices, Eph. iv. 19; v. 3, 5; Col. iii. 5.

Confirmation of the warning: **Because that** (Rom. i. 19, 21) **the Lord** (BENGEL: *Christus judex*) **is an avenger** (*vindex*, Rom. xiii. 4) **for all these things**; the most diverse sins (suits better, if the previous discourse was at least of two kinds of sin, and not merely of two forms of the same sin); comp. 1 Cor. v. 11; vi. 9, 10; Gal. v. 19 sqq.†

* [Luther's Catechism retains the Roman Catholic arrangement of the decalogue, which divides the tenth commandment into two to make up for the omission of the second.—J. L.]

* [*Per contra*, ELLICOTT: "The clause is not merely parallel to the anarthrous εἰδέναι, but reverts to the preceding ἁγιασμός" (ELLICOTT on this point agreeing with LÜNEMANN), "of which it presents a specific exemplification more immediately suggested by the second part of ver. 4. First, πορνεία is prohibited; then a holy use of its natural remedy affirmatively inculcated; and lastly, the heinous sin of μοιχεία, especially as regarded in its social aspects, formally denounced. So rightly Chrys. (ἐνταῦθα περὶ μοιχείας φησίν· ἀνωτέρω δὲ καὶ περὶ πορνείας πάσης), and after him Theod., Theophyl., Œcum., and the majority of modern commentators. To regard the verse with Calv., Grot., and recently De Wette, Lünem., Koch, as referring to the fraud and covetousness in the affairs of life, is (*a*) to infringe on the plain meaning of τῷ πράγματι; (*β*) to obscure the reference to the key-word of the paragraph, ἀκαθαρσία, ver. 7; (*γ*) to mar the contextual symmetry of the verses; and, lastly, to introduce an exegesis so frigid and unnatural, as to make us wonder that such good names should be associated with an interpretation so seemingly improbable." So ALFORD and JOWETT. Comp. Notes a and b in the *Revision* of this verse.—J. L.]

† [Our Translators, following the Bishops' Bible, seem to have taken τούτων as masculine, for the transgressors (WELLS, BARNES, SHARPE, CONYBEARE), or for the injured parties. But all the other older English versions have

Even as we also told you before, not merely before this Epistle; that idea lies simply in the aorist (when we were with you, even then our oral teaching was to no other effect); but the προ (comp. προλέγω with προεῖπον, Gal. v. 21) contains a reference to the coming of Christ to judgment: "before it happens;" **and** (by way of corroboration) **fully testified** (ch. ii. 12 [11]). CALVIN: *tanta enim est hominum tarditas, ut nisi acriter perculsi nullo divini judicii sensu tangantur.*

5. (Vv. 7, 8.) **For God did not call,** &c.—What prompted the exhortation, a return to the fundamental idea of v. 3. The change from ἐπί to ἐν is not without design. The former might possibly mark the condition: *on the ground of.* But to specify a ground, even in a negative way, does not accord with the free grace of the call. But, since the purpose of an action is the motive of it, ἐπί may also express *for the purpose of, hac lege ut essemus,* Gal. v. 13; Eph. ii. 10; WINER, § 48, C. [WEBSTER and WILKINSON: "on the understanding of."—J. L.]). Ἐν, on the contrary, is internal; it may be understood by breviloquence (*in order to be in*) as equivalent to εἰς (WINER, § 50, 5; 1 Cor. vii. 15 with Col. iii. 15); but also of the essential nature of the καλεῖν (BENGEL, HOFMANN): in the offer and operation of sanctification the καλεῖν existed; that was the element in which the καλεῖν moved. The Apostle does not think so specially as we do of sanctification as a gradual subdual of the flesh, but it is for him separation from the world for God, the being made partakers of His Spirit; ἐν as Gal. i. 6; Eph. vi. 4.

Wherefore then he that despiseth [*rejecteth*];*—ἀθετεῖν, *to invalidate, treat as null;* more rarely with a personal object: *to reject* (Luke x. 16); in the Septuagint frequently for בָּגַד. Is. xxi. 2; xxiv. 16. To the participle some supply ἐμέ, others τοῦτο, τὴν ἐν ἁγιασμῷ κλῆσιν, τὰς παραγγελίας (v. 2), not incorrectly as regards the sense, but grammatically it is better to take it (with DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN, HOFMANN [JOWETT, ALFORD, ELLICOTT]) as without an object, substantively: *the despiser* [*rejecter*]. In what follows we must not take οὐκ for οὐ μόνον, which weakens the force of the statement, but thus: The man, through whom the commands were conveyed to him, does not even come into view by the side of the despising of God, from whom they spring. In the case of ἄνθρωπον, to think with ŒCUMENIUS, PELT, of the overreached brother, v. 6, or even with HOFMANN of the misused woman, and the brother injured through covetousness, is still more out of the way.†

In the addition: **who** (also,‡ together with the calling) **giveth** (continuously), or **gave** (once) **His Holy Spirit unto you,** lies the climax of the exhortation. With the reading, *unto us,* one might think of the Apostles, who speak from the Spirit (1 Cor. vii. 40), whose word therefore is not to be despised, or again (since this apologetic assurance is here uncalled for) of Christians generally. The better attested ὑμᾶς, however, is for the readers: He giveth (or gave) into you [*in euch hinein,* for εἰς ὑμᾶς] His Spirit, the Holy Spirit, who incites to sanctification, to dwell in you; and thus (DE WETTE, OLSHAUSEN), along with the commandment, the gift also of discernment, illumination through the prophets among you (ch. v. 20), and the spirit of discernment in yourselves (ch. v. 21), so that ye are able to judge whether I speak from myself—so that ye are θεοδίδακτοι (v. 9); and thus to you, moreover, sanctification is made a possible thing, for surely ye have not in vain received His Holy Spirit (EWALD); ye are, therefore, also the more inexcusable, if ye despise His commandments, grieve the Holy Spirit, and resist His discipline (Eph. iv. 30; LÜNEMANN, HOFMANN).

the word *things,* and nearly all commentators agree in making the pronoun neuter.—Our author's remark on πάντα ταῦτα—made frequently by those who take his view of τὸ μὴ ὑπερβ. κ.τ.λ.—is of no weight. Why may not the reference be to the various forms of fleshly uncleanness?—J. L.]

* [See Critical Note 11.—J. L.]

† [ELLICOTT: "*a man, any man,* with a latent reference to the Apostle."—J. L.]

‡ [The author brackets the καί also in the translation. See Critical Note 12.—J. L.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. (V. 1.) There is danger in knowing the way, and not going forward (James i. 22). Standing still tends to backsliding. The point is, to walk continually, step by step, even to the mark. CHRYSOSTOM: The earth returns more than is given to it.—But this as fruit, from the living force of the seed; no *opera supererogationis.* The true περισσεύειν is not any acting over and above the commandments (v. 2), but a more and more willing fulfilment of the commandments. ZWINGLI: No one can here be perfect, and he that standeth, let him take heed lest he fall. Daily we fall and sin; let us also daily arise.—That requires an ever fresh exhortation and admonition in the midst of the frivolity of an age, which heedlessly despises the judgment of God.—RIEGER: When one has once received from another something pertaining to instruction in the matter of salvation, this forms a tie between hearts, such that one may hope to effect a still further advance. A word received with love into the heart communicates to us also an impulse to become ever more perfect. [MATTHEW HENRY: The Apostle taught them how to walk, not how to talk.—ADAM CLARKE: God sets no *bounds* to the communications of His grace and Spirit to them that are faithful. And as there are no bounds to the *graces,* so there should be none to the *exercise* of those graces.—J. L.]

2. (V. 2). BENGEL remarks, that in the Epistles to the only recently founded church at Thessalonica the Apostle speaks frequently of his commands; but seldom in Epistles to churches of longer standing. Evangelical freedom is no antinomianism. The ordinances of God require the obedience of faith. Absolute autonomy and creaturehood are mutually irreconcilable. The way to true Christian freedom lies through the obedience of faith.

3. (V. 3.) Sanctification is separation from the things of the world, purification from the pollution of the flesh, the surrender of ourselves to the service of God, to the dominion of the spirit over the flesh, for a pure offering to God who is holy, that is, who abides like Himself, asserting Himself in His spirituality, and therefore with an absolute superiority, not only to everything impure, but to all that is created. Lev. xix. 2, Ye shall be holy, for I am holy.—RIEGER: Under the impulse of His Spirit it pervades the whole man, so that all his powers and members are occupied in the service of righteousness. To this points even the emotion of shame, wherein is proclaimed a consciousness of the fall, and a longing after original innocence.—THE SAME: We must not regard sanctification as such a lofty

virtue, that only a very few are required to strive after it (comp. Heb. xii. 14).

4. (Vv. 3–6.) We need not be surprised at this warning against gross sins. The gospel does not cut off magically at one blow all danger of seduction. Gross sins on one side, great workings of the Spirit on the other—such is the mighty contrast in the primitive churches. Nowadays everything is brought much nearer to a level. Besides, the lust of the flesh and the thirst for gain are the capital vices, not merely of heathenism, but to this very day especially of so many a rich commercial town.

5. (3–5.) Sensuality is a peculiarly powerful lust of the natural man, and strives against sanctification. Heathen laxity accounts it a matter of indifference, unless some right of wedlock is infringed; nay, by a reciprocal influence of error and lusts (Eph. iv. 22), and in consequence of a wicked ignorance of the holy God, heathenism, while deifying the natural instinct, sanctions even a "holy" debauchery, and that even to the most unnatural abominations (comp. my *Discourse on the calling of the prophet Hosea*, Basel). Even the nobler heathens, *e. g.* PLATO in the *Symposium*, sometimes commend in the wise man as a sublime continence that without which a Christian were no Christian, while they speak of shameful things without any holy abhorrence. How feeble is their protest even against pederasty! And, sure enough, what a state of things was that of the Roman world at that time! A quite different spirit of earnest opposition was shown already even by the law of the Old Covenant (Lev. xviii. 30; Deut. xxii. 21; xxiii. 17); and the gospel thoroughly enforces the demand for resistance even to the secrecy of the thoughts (Matt. v. 28). On one occasion the Apostle appeals to the Christian sense of honor: Ye will not, surely, take the members of Christ, and make them the members of a harlot (1 Cor. vi. 15)? and then again as here: Ye will not be willing, I hope, to live as do the heathen? Such admonitions are still needed by us. For the prevailing tendency is to think far too lightly of the fleshly lusts, which yet war against the soul.—RIEGER: When a stale Christianity is ever anew reviving all heathenish vanities in operas, plays, novels, shameful pictures and images, it falls again likewise, along with heathenish unbelief, into heathenish fornication.—To subdue it is not an affair of a single resolution, but of continuous practice.—CHRYSOSTOM: of an earnest discipline—grounded in a knowledge of one's own bodily and mental disposition, and showing itself by caution in intercourse, avoidance of all temptations, of all impurity in look, gesture, touch, of all seductive reading. whereby the evil treasure of the heart is enlarged, by laying hold of the Divine help, turning to account past experiences, perseverance in prayer, serious contemplation of the shortness of life and the preciousness of the faculties vouchsafed, by exerting the same with faithful diligence, and, above all, by overcoming in the blood of Jesus (Rev. xii. 11).

A principal means, and one of Divine appointment, is the holy and honorable use of marriage; "*incontinentiæ medicina et continentia ipsa*," *C. Helv.* 29. But it must not be contracted in a way of carnal frivolity, nor carried on in a spirit of carnal license. Paul speaks of these things without any absurd prudery or spurious spirituality; what belongs to nature he mentions without disguise, does not dispute what is due to a natural necessity, but insists on discipline and a hallowed method in the satisfaction of this instinct. We ought to be thankful for this sober teaching, equally remote as it is from a false burdening of the conscience through monkish perverseness (comp. 1 Cor. vii. 3–5, in opposition to a merely nominal marriage), and from a privileged explanation of immoderate fleshly lust. Nor are we at liberty to decline even the humiliation implied in the assignment of motive, 1 Cor. vii. 2.

ZWINGLI: Paul does not altogether forbid the affection—*quis enim sine affectu cohabitat uxori suæ?*—but whatever in that regard is immoderate and disorderly.—What is essential in holy wedlock is the helping of one another to grow in the rule of the spirit (RIEGER: sanctification with reference to God and His service); this Divine aim in connection with what is humanly noble, to be mindful of one's own honor, and not less of the honor and dignity of the woman in a due regard to her personality. This requires a constant modesty; for the Divinely ordained instinct (Gen. i. 28; ii. 24) is no longer since the fall to be regarded as uninjured (Gen. iii. 7). Whoever abandons himself without reserve to lust, in his case it degenerates for his punishment into a ruling passion, of which he becomes the slave.

6. (V. 5.) *That the Gentiles know not God* (Gal. iv. 8; Eph. ii. 12; iv. 17 sqq.); this statement seems to be contradicted, not merely by so many beautiful expressions of the heathen respecting Divine things, but by the Apostle's own words, when he pronounces them inexcusable, Rom. i. 19 sqq., for the very reason that they know God by His creation. But the principle of reconciliation is found in the last mentioned passage itself. When they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, and thus their thoughts became vain and their foolish heart was darkened. They held down* the truth in unrighteousness. They consequently do not know God as the God before whom we stand, the Holy One with eyes of flame, who is Spirit and not flesh; whom we know only in proportion to our sanctification; for it is only when we are willing to strive after that which is the will of God, that we receive also the witness of the Spirit, and attain to the full knowedge of Him as the Searcher of our life. Even of men, whom we know merely by sight or from hearsay, not from personal intercourse, we do not say that we know them. In this full, living sense, therefore, the heathen know not God (τὸν θεόν, the one, true God). This is a guilty ignorance, of which the general and the individual guilt are in an inverse proportion. But even the better views—how fragmentary are they, and how little do they amount to an undoubting, salutary, popularly pervasive knowledge!

7. (V. 6.) Paul frequently brings together the two capital vices, lust and covetousness; comp. also Heb. xiii. 4, 5. Between these two diverging sins there is affinity and contrast. Both are characterized by unfaithfulness, unbelief, as if God did not see or avenge—as if He were not a Spirit, nor holy. The man who is unfaithful to God in regard to his body, that nearest of possessions, is easily so likewise in reference to property of every kind, and *vice versa.* Or perhaps sin develops itself in a one-sided way. Libertines may be loyal and generous in money matters; honest people are frequently covetous, niggardly, bent on their own advantage. Indeed, covetousness is the vice of upright people, and is often joined to a pharisaic religionism; it is also much more rarely confessed than other sins. BINET

* [German: *niederhalten*, for κατεχόντων.—J. L.]

gives us the statement of a Catholic confessor, that in twenty years innumerable sins had been confessed to him, but not in a single instance covetousness. Then perhaps, in circumstances of special temptation, the mischief breaks out also in the other direction. Not being thoroughly faithful, they have no power of resistance.

8. (Vv. 7, 8.) The Divine call, and, along with that, the communication of the Holy Spirit, enhance responsibility (Luke xii. 48). And indeed the final measure of all sin is not the injury done to our neighbors, but the contempt put upon God (Ex. xvi. 7; 1 Sam. viii. 7). People are fain to put forward as an excuse their dislike to men.—Zwingli: The parson I will not listen to, the false teacher, the heretic;—such is the talk of those who do not dare openly to reject God.—To what extent may the cause of the teacher be identified with that of God? A wicked, hierarchical abuse is certainly possible, and occurs when the privilege of the teacher's position is throughout, and without question, asserted as infallible; contrary to Matt. xvi. 17, 23; Gal. ii. 11 sqq.; 1 Cor. x. 15; 2 Cor. i. 24. Nevertheless, Luke x. 16 remains in force, in so far as the servants of Christ take upon themselves, above all things, the obligation implied in this promise. And all penitential confession is complete only in the direct personal reference to God (B. li. 6 [4]); when the sinner begins clearly to perceive, that God's commandments are no human fancies. The more light a man has received, so much the more heinous is his transgression. To grieve the Holy Spirit, with an ever-increasing constancy to do Him despite, may grow into the sin that is never forgiven. Comp. on this point my Discourse in the *apologetische Beiträge von* Gess *und* Riggenbach, Basel, 1863. For this reason the exhortation, which began with beseeching in Christ, becomes at the close a menace pointing to the vengeance of the Judge. The gospel knows nothing of the idea, that the fear of God's judgment is an inadmissible motive. Its preaching is throughout two-edged.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

V. 1. To beseech, where one might command, a model for Christ's ministers (2 Cor. v. 20).—Heubner: The exhortation proceeds, 1. on the command of Christ, not of men (nor yet arbitrarily); 2. by His love to us; 3. by our love to Him; 4. by His future appearing.—*Burlenburger Bibel:* God beseeches and exhorts, though according to His right and His power he might well threaten and command. Therein appears his kindness and love toward man [Tit. iii. 4]. With so much the greater force should this gracious style of injunction shame and subdue the otherwise hard natural heart.—[See Bishop Beveridge's Brief Notes on this verse.—J. L.]

V. 3. Stähelin: First holy, then peaceable; this will of God thou wilt not be able to annul.—Heubner: All commandments have one object, sanctification. The special Christian motives to sanctification: 1. It is an obligation of gratitude; 2. it is the sign of the reconciliation received [Rom. v. 11]; 3. Christ is made unto us sanctification [1 Cor. i. 30]; 4. we owe it to the world; without it, we do the world an injury, and dishonor Christ.—The same: The call of Christianity, a call to sanctification.—*Burlenburger Bibel:* To this point is the sum and substance of all Holy Writ directed, that the people of God should also live godly. It is not possible that an unholy person should come into fellowship with God, the Holy One.—[*For this is the will of God, your sanctification;*—the text of Massillon's third Sermon *pour une profession religieuse.*—J. L.]

Heubner: Christ the Guardian of our chastity.—Chrysostom: Men are led to fornication by luxury, wealth, levity, idleness, leisure. These occasions must be cut off. In particular, he gives an impressive warning against adultery, as the consequence of the early practice of fornication. "Bear with me, if I seem to speak what is impure, as if I had laid aside shame and blushing; for it is with reluctance that I submit to this, but for their sakes, who are not ashamed of the deeds, am I compelled to utter the words. You are ashamed to hear of it? It is, however, the deeds that you are ashamed of, not of the words." He speaks of these things, he says, as a surgeon probes a festering wound. "It is not youth that is responsible for them, otherwise all young men must be licentious; but we fling ourselves into the funeral pile."—*Burlenburger Bibel:* A man may restrain himself from all outward eruptions of evil lust, and yet be inwardly full of the stench of the filthiest thoughts and desires.

V. 2. Who is allowed to say that he knows God? The man who loves Him, keeps His commandments, stands in sanctification.

Vv. 3–6. The similarity and difference of the two capital vices mentioned by the Apostle.—Covetousness itself is an uncleanness.

[V. 7. Leighton: It is sacrilege for you to dispose of yourselves after the impure manner of the world, and to apply yourselves to any profane use, whom God hath consecrated to Himself.—J. L.]

Vv. 6–8. Dread of the Judge and Avenger is not set aside even by the gospel. 1. Servile fear, indeed (Rom. viii. 15), hath torment and is not in love (1 John iv. 18); but every one who does not fear is not therefore a child of God; better than careless or insolent frivolity, the fear of God is the beginning of wisdom. 2. Nay, within the sphere of grace, it is needful to use it with fear and trembling, that it be not turned into lasciviousness (2 Cor. v. 11; Phil. ii. 12 [Jude 4]). 3. But the fear of God, the only Judge, is identical with trust in Him, the only Saviour and Protector (Matt. x. 28–31).—[Leighton: Men are ready to find out poor shifts to deceive themselves, when they have some way deceived their brother, and to stop the mouth of their own conscience with some quibble and some slight excuse, and force themselves at length to believe they have done no wrong. Therefore the Apostle, to fright them out of their shifts, sets before them an exacter Judge, who cannot be deceived nor mocked, who shall one day unveil the conscience, and blow away these vain self-excuses as smoke; and that just Lord will punish all injustice.—J. L.]—*Berlenburger Bibel:* The despising [rejecting] occurs also through a hypocritical faith, when the way of sanctification is refused as savoring of legalism. The flesh makes ever-fresh trials, whether it may be able to regain its old ascendency.

Vv. 1–8. Stockmeyer (in a series of manuscript Sermons, of which he has most kindly allowed us the use): Exhortation to sanctification: 1. Why is it still a necessity for a church even of true Christians? Their standing is already in sanctification, but they need to become ever more perfect: a. they are still far from having attained to the measure of

Christ's example; it behooves them to strive against the temptation to a self-satisfied stationariness; b. the tendencies to sin are powerful; earlier habits of sin still retain an influence; whereas no department of life is to remain unsanctified, and no toleration is to be given to stubbornness, indolence, excuses, or palliations; otherwise sanctification gradually expires. 2. What are the particular points made prominent by the Apostle according to the special need of his readers? the two capital sins of the heathen world, fleshly lust and greed of gain. a. To offer wanton apologies for the former is to sink back into heathenism, which knows nothing of God. b. The second is a reckless encroaching on one's neighbor. Against this Paul warns, at the same time that he fully recognizes brotherly love (vv. 9, 10); for a man may contribute to charitable objects, and yet all the while seek advantages in trade, that are an overreaching of his neighbors. But he who on these points is free from reproach, let him try himself whether there are not others, in which his sanctification is still defective. 3. What is the serious admonition with which the Apostle confirms and strengthens his word of exhortation? The proclaimer of evangelical grace speaks of punishment from an avenging God. On all ungodliness of men rests God's wrath; he, therefore, who scorns the way prepared by God's grace for escaping that wrath, forsakes the way of grace, and must be overtaken by the wrath; yea, he is worthy of a far sorer condemnation than heathens and Jews, just because to him the Spirit was given. Yes, help to achieve the victory is proffered to him in the strength of the Spirit.

1 Thess. iv. 1–7 is the Epistle for the Sunday *Reminiscere*.

II.

Incitement to growth in brotherly love, and, that love be not prejudiced, to quiet and sober industry.

Ch. IV. 9–12.

9 But as touching [But concerning, περὶ δέ] brotherly love ye need not that I
write [have no need that *one* write][1] unto you: for ye yourselves are taught
10 of God to love one another: and indeed ye [for ye also, καὶ γάρ] do it toward
all the brethren which are in all Macedonia [that are in the whole of M.]:[2] but
we beseech [exhort][3] you, brethren, that ye increase more and more [to abound
11 yet more],[4] and that ye [and to] study to be quiet, and to do your own business,
and to work with your own[5] hands, as [according as, καθώς] we commanded
12 you; that ye may walk honestly [becomingly][6] toward them that are without
[those without, τοὺς ἔξω], and *that* ye may [and may] have lack [need][7] of
nothing.[8]

[1] V. 1.—[οὐ χρείαν ἔχετε γράφειν. Comp. ch. v. 1; and i. 8, Critical Note 4.—J. L.] A. D.[3] E. K. L. Sin.[1], and many read ἔχετε; D.[1] F. G. Sin.[2] [Vulgate, Chrysostom, Lachmann, &c.], ἔχομεν, which is easier; B., εἴχομεν; 4 minuscules, with ἔχετε, have γράφεσθαι, comp. ch. v. 1. See the Exegesis.

[2] V. 10.—[τοὺς ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Μακ.] It is of no importance to the sense, whether we read or omit τούς after ἀδελφούς. Sin.[1] is quite alone in reading ἀδ. ὑμῶν ἐν.

[3] V. 10.—[παρακαλοῦμεν. Comp. ch. iii. 2, Critical Note 2.—J. L.]

[4] V. 10.—[περισσεύειν μᾶλλον. Comp. v. 1, Critical Note 5.—J. L.]

[5] V. 11.—ἰδίαις is wanting in B. D.[1] F. G. [Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott. The last—probably through inadvertence—retains it in the Translation.—J. L.], but is found in A. D.[3] K. L. Sin.[1] [Knapp, Hahn, Riggenbach, bracket it.—J. L.]

[6] V. 12.—[εὐσχημόνως. *Revision:* "The use of *honest* as = *honorable, comely* (see E. V. Rom. xii. 17; 2 Cor. xiii. 7; Phil. iv. 8; &c.) is now obsolete."—J. L.]

[7] V. 12.—[*Revision:* "The word χρεία occurs 49 times in the N. T., and is nowhere else *lack* in E. V., which here follows the Bishops' Bible."—J. L.]

[8] V. 12.—[Or, as in the English margin, *of no man*;—which Riggenbach, and very many others, including Ellicott (in the Commentary, not the Translation) prefer. See the Exegesis.—J. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. (Vv. 9, 10.) **But concerning brotherly love, &c.**—The exhortation here turns to a new side of sanctification. Brotherly love (ch. iii. 12) is love to our fellow-Christians, who have the same Father (1 John v. 1), and is the centre of love to all men (2 Pet. i. 7), the Christian loving generally his neighbors on account of the hope, to which he knows and believes them to be called (Col. i. 4, 5 *). The proof of love which Paul praises in the Thessalonians (ποιεῖτε, v. 10), is perhaps chiefly, yet not exclusively, the rendering of actual help to those in distress.—The reading ἔχετε with γράφειν Lünemann declares to be meaningless. But the two variations, ἔχομεν or γράφεσθαι, might still suggest as the more difficult the reading rejected by Lünemann. As the subject of γράφειν we must supply ἡμᾶς, or assume that it is used impersonally: that *one* write unto you (of the writing to you ye have no need). Regularly it would be in the passive, as at ch. v. 1 (Heb. v. 12, τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς τινά, is, of course, somewhat different *). On the use of the infinitive

* [A very questionable reference. The love there spoken of is love to the saints; and, besides, the διά of v. 5 is best connected, not with τὴν ἀγάπην of v. 4, but with εὐχαριστοῦμεν of v. 3.—J. L.]

* [Besides that the τινά there is often read τίνα, and construed with τὰ στοιχεῖα.—J. L.]

active, where the passive might have been expected, comp. WINER, § 44. 8, Note 1. LÜNEMANN, indeed, would allow of the application of this rule only where the infinitive is used simply as a substantive, not where it governs a case.—OLSHAUSEN (with the reading ἔχομεν) finds the antithesis: When *God* teaches you, *I* may be silent. But ἔχετε likewise gives an antithesis: Ye need not that one *write* unto you; for *ye yourselves* are, &c.* **Taught of God**, θεοδίδακτοι, not *respecting* God, but according to the analogy of such compounds, *by* God (comp. John vi. 45; Is. liv. 13; Jer. xxxi. 34; Ps. xvi. 7); not merely, that is, historically, but of God's word in the Old Testament, or from Jesus' commandment of love (John xiii.), or through the prophets amongst you (ch. v. 20), but inwardly through the Holy Ghost (v. 8).—Εἰς τό, as ch. iii. 10 and several times already, marks the end and aim of the teaching.—**For ye also do it** (the ἀγαπᾶν), and thus show by deeds that ye are taught of God. **Toward [all] the brethren that are in the whole of Macedonia**, not merely in Thessalonica; which implies a lively intercourse with the Christians in Philippi, Berœa, and perhaps at small scattered stations, offshoots from the central churches. Of this zeal of love he must have been informed by Timothy. The interval since their conversion was long enough for the purpose (against BAUR).—But why was it necessary to write to such persons against fornication, and especially against πλεονεξία, according to our view? Was not this excluded beforehand by brotherly love? Well, the very purpose of his warning is, that temptation should not overthrow them. He certainly makes no such reproach as: "There *are* amongst you many πόρνοι;" nor yet: "many πλεονέκται;" merely this: "You might be threatened with it; temptation is strong;" and even with a good disposition a man, whose integrity is not perfect, may deceive himself in regard to prevailing sins. It is with individuals that the evil begins (*a little leaven*, &c., 1 Cor. v. 6); and there are particular sinful tendencies, the criminality of which is less recognized (again: *a little leaven*). There are, in fact, inward contradictions, imperfect conditions; and so even a tendency to uncleanness, to greediness, where there is yet, on the other hand, a zealous love. Now, the Apostle would strengthen them, while he writes encouragingly: You know truly what brotherly love requires, and act accordingly; only it is still important, that ye become ever more perfect; then too will you be ever less in danger from πλεονεξία. Thus in "Ye have no need that one write unto you" we have no mere figure of speech (*transitio;* [CHRYSOSTOM, THEOPHYLACT, PELT, LÜNEMANN, ELLICOTT]), no delicate turn of mere *urbanitas* [SCHOTT], but what was intended as a serious acknowledgment of the actual existence amongst them in power of brotherly love. The figure of speech is real; it appeals to what is already true of them, and then says: Go on, improve (so DE WETTE). *To abound yet more*, was the general exhortation of v. 1; it recurs in v. 10 in this particular relation;—in brotherly love, not in a mere outward spending for cases of necessity. (Unnatural is EWALD's reference of περισσεύειν to what follows: *Yet far more and emulously to be quiet*).

2. (V. 11.) **And to place your honor therein [And to study]** *.—We are not to supply from what precedes, *in brotherly love.* Opposed to this is the fact, 1. that φιλοτιμεῖσθαι commonly governs an infinitive, and most naturally, therefore, in the present instance, the immediately following ἡσυχάζειν &c.; for, 2. unless the latter be allowed to depend on φιλοτ., it would stand (awkwardly) attached by asyndeton. The word φιλοτ. has two meanings: *to be ambitious, fond of honor;* with the infinitive: *to place one's honor in a thing, to emulate, zealously strive* (2 Cor. v. 9; Rom. xv. 20). Here, in what? In something that the world does not highly value. BENGEL notices the "Oxymoron: φιλοτιμία *politica erubescit* ἡσυχάζειν." It is, therefore, instead of shining and seeking a false renown, to seek honor rather in being quiet; tranquil, calm in God (in contrast with a wordy volubility, RIEGER); concerned about the training of the hidden man of the heart (1 Pet. iii. 4); comp. ἡσυχία, 2 Thess. iii. 11, 12; 1 Tim. ii. 2, 11, 12; where the opposite is περιεργάζεσθαι, πολυπραγμοσύνη, a loud, ostentatious officiousness—the driving disposition, which with its zeal about incidental matters affects a deceptive substitute for Phil. ii. 12. This ἡσυχ. branches out in the sequel on two sides: a. τὰ ἴδια πράσσειν, and b. ἐργάζεσθαι ταῖς χερσίν, which is not the same thing. The former—in the classics, τὰ ἑαυτοῦ or ἑαυτῶν πράσσειν (see Wetstein)—is *to attend to one's own affairs*, and so to serve God with fidelity in the calling which every individual has received *for himself*, instead of that bustling, obtrusive meddling with other men's matters (1 Pet. iv. 15), in which spiritual conceit finds occupation. This, consequently, belongs to the spirit of the calling, according to its individual characteristics; and the manifestation of this proper feeling is to work with one's own hands. The work does not jar with the quietness, but is promotive of it. It is only by a multiplicity of aims that the quietness is disturbed. *With the hands*, as Paul did (ch. ii. 9; Acts xx. 34).—**According as we commanded you.** This exhortation, therefore, belonged also to the commandments which he had given from the first (v. 2); comp. 2 Thess. iii. 10. From the beginning he clearly foresaw the possibility of an unwholesome deterioration; nor did this require longer time for its development (against BAUR). Most of the Thessalonians, it is probable, were literally handicraftsmen, and hence the expression, from which then follows an application of the principle to every calling. But even spiritual employments were connected with manual labor (Paul). And in Ps. xc. 17 the expression, *the work of our hands*, goes beyond mere handicraft.

3. (V. 12.) **That ye**, &c.—This statement of the purpose is by EWALD made dependent on παρηγγείλαμεν, and so on the parenthetical clause; better by LÜNEMANN, HOFMANN and others, on the verb of the principal clause, παρακαλοῦμεν—φιλοτιμ. &c.; it not merely was, but it still is, the object of his ex-

* [LÜNEMANN and ELLICOTT lay "the principal emphasis on the fact of their being already taught"—θεοδίδακτοι;—ALFORD, on αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς.—J. L.]

* [φιλοτιμεῖσθαι—found also in Rom. xv. 20 and 2 Cor. v. 9. ELLICOTT: "In all, perhaps, some idea of τιμή may be recognized, but in 2 Cor. *l. c.* and in the present passage that meaning recedes into the background." In most versions and commentaries, however, it is retained, as by our German: *die Ehre darein zu setzen;* and WORDSWORTH: "The love of glory, the moving passion of the Greeks. . . . The Apostle turns the eager stream of their vainglorious activity, loving ever to be seen, and exulting in the foam and spray of its own restlessness, into a quiet lake of religious life, clear and deep, reflecting in its peaceful mirror the calmness of heaven." And he quotes Is. xxx. 7.—J. L.]

hortation. This object likewise again divides itself into propriety, seemliness of deportment (1 Cor. xiv. 40; vii. 35), and a generous independence; such will be the result of a quiet performance of one's own business, and of diligence in labor. The first thought was of God; then come the brethren; and finally those without also are not forgotten. This was the title given by the Jews to the Gentiles; by the gospel, to those who are outside of the true Church, whether Jews or Gentiles (1 Cor. v. 12). Toward them also Christendom has an obligation of love, the Missionary office (comp. Col. iv. 5; 1 Cor. x. 32).—**And may have need of nothing** [or, **of no one**]. As people who earn their own bread. Μηδενός is by CALVIN (*nulla re*), BENGEL, LÜNEMANN [JOWETT, ALFORD, &c.], taken as neuter: *want for nothing* [Rev. iii. 17]; LÜNEM.: "To stand in need of no man is for man an impossibility." But the limitation of the idea is obvious from the context [so ELLICOTT]. If Lünemann did not twist the idea into that of indigence, he would have to object to his own explanation, that it is not less impossible for a man to stand in need of nothing. Of course, it cannot absolutely be proved neither, that the word must be taken as masculine. The strongest argument is its proximity to τοὺς ἔξω. *To have need of no one*—of those without? but to them they could least apply;—of the Christians? for this there is least in the context. We do best to take it (with SCHOTT, DE WETTE, HOFMANN) quite generally and without more precise definition: Through honest labor and quiet trust in God you will be free from the necessity of having recourse to men. Where an exigency arose invincible even by the most faithful diligence, there was then scope for the exercise of brotherly love.

4. (Vv. 9–12.) But a question still remains as to the connection of the two halves of this section, and particularly of vv. 10 and 11. In the close connection of the two infinitives περισσ. and φιλοτ. by means of καί many, since CHRYSOSTOM, THEODORET, &c., have recognized the indication of an inward union; CHRYSOSTOM: It is the part of love, not to receive, but to give. Others otherwise. Many, as DE WETTE: I exhort you to grow ever in brotherly love, still to increase in your readiness to benefit your brethren, and also in your care not to endanger love through indolence, whereby you would become a burden to one another (ch. v. 14), and would at last incur the blame of rendering it impossible, that all should any longer love the brethren aright. This would be said especially to the poor: Beware of abusing this doctrine. Ye too may practise brotherly love, if ye walk orderly; ye too would fall into πλεονεκτεῖν through indolence, particularly that of a seemingly spiritual sort. But LÜNEMANN protests with reason against the division of the church into two classes. Even φιλοτιμ. &c. is said to all, and the working with their own hands comes in only secondarily, being preceded by that about being quiet and doing their own business, which concerns all. LÜNEMANN, however, appears to be mistaken in regarding φιλοτιμ. as something new hastily fastened on, and having no reference to what goes before. The connection of the two infinitives by καί binds them together as *one* exhortation: Still to grow in love, and also in your zeal for being quiet, every one working out his own salvation, and faithfully performing also his external labor—every one emulously inciting his neighbor, and allowing himself to be incited, to fidelity; this too belongs to love (Heb. x. 24, 25). Thus, the new exhortation likewise is added with a view to saving brotherly love from being damaged; and even outwardly among the worldly-minded the opposite course of conduct would create offence, and so in that quarter also would violate the obligation of love (HOFMANN compares Eph. iv. 28).

The excitement, against which Paul has to warn the Thessalonians, is not at all of a political (ZWINGLI), but religious nature. They were adrift in a new world of ideas, and in more than one instance perhaps had thus been deprived of bread. NEANDER and most assume an eschatological complexion, as if they were absorbed in the kingdom of heaven. DE WETTE, on the contrary, would confine himself to pious excitement generally, because Paul makes no mention of the eschatological ground, but rather speaks quite freely (ch. v. 1 sqq.) of the last things, and indeed in such a way precisely, as might easily through misapprehension occasion an increase of the agitation; which he would hardly have done, had the agitation already been of that character. He therefore confines himself to the supposition of an idle officiousness, proselytism, concern for the salvation of other people's souls, &c. [WORDSWORTH also speaks of the spirit of περιεργία, πολυπραγμοσύνη, and ἀλλοτριοεπισκοπία as "characteristic of the Greek population long before the gospel appeared. Comp. Acts xvii. 21; 1 Tim. v. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 15; and the commentators on Juvenal, iii. 61–70."—J. L.] Still LÜNEMANN is right in holding fast to the idea, that the expectation of the last things, whereby earthly interests were reduced in importance in their eyes, had formed the centre of their excitement. To this, he thinks, we are led by the context, the transition to the eschatological question, v. 13 sqq., being well accounted for by the association of ideas, and the writer then resuming, ch. v. 12 sqq., his practical exhortations (somewhat differently HOFMANN, see on v. 13). We only add, that even the section ch. iv. 13–v. 11 results in practical exhortations, against despondency, and to a sober vigilance. In giving heed to the νήφωμεν of ch. v. 6, 8, they would not be cut off from watchfulness and waiting for the Lord, but only from an unsound πολυπραγμοσύνη. The Apostle's words, therefore, contain really nothing, whereby a spurious excitement, even if it were of an eschatological nature, could be increased.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. (V. 9.) Christian beneficence was a new virtue, altogether unknown to the heathen. "See, how they love one another!" was the saying amongst those, who still looked on from without (comp. John xiii. 34, 35; 1 Pet. i. 22; 3 John 5, 6). But the outward manifestation must not be separated from its inner root, brotherly love. Almsgiving from sympathy with external suffering, doing good generally on principles of humanity, philanthropy, faith in mankind, these things are not to be despised, but must be distinguished from Christian brotherly love. In many philanthropic enterprises there has been exhibited a remarkable persistency that may well put Christians to shame; but frequently also motives of selfishness, calculation, ambition have betrayed a temper at variance with the Christian spirit. The Christian, understanding by his own case the ruin of man, knows that the deep

est root of an enduring love, the true strength of an unwearying patience, the assurance of the highest aim over and above the mere outward relief, consists only in his loving his neighbors as sons of the same Father through the One Son of the Father. Wherever this life from God really exists in force, there is found the capacity of a vigorous, unobstructed love. And this is no spirit of particularism —as little so, or even less so than the Old Testament separateness of the people of God. Human perversity, it is possible, may turn it into a matter of narrow sectarian partisanship, and thereby vitiate love itself. The truth is that love to those, who are already brethren in fact, is the hearth at which the flame is fed, that we may further love those also who are still to become so. This brotherhood, however, does not stand in a formula, but in the life from God, of which the first token is a sense for what is holy.

2. To be taught of God is the great end to which all are called. God, who is love, teaches to love; "*doctrinæ divinæ vis confluit in amorem*," BENGEL. With regard to the means: God's word of the Old and New Testaments, expounded by its living preachers, is not to be refused; but it does not elucidate what is most vital, the immediate relation between God and man, between Spirit and spirit. In the consummation no one will teach his brother, saying, Know the Lord, for they will all know Him, and that from their own experience of the forgiveness of sins (Jer. xxxi. 34). This does not exclude, as the way to this highest end, mutual assistance, the edification of one another (ch. v. 11), the service, especially, of gifted members (1 Cor. xii. 8, 28); and this is the ordinary way, for the Divine illumination is not one independent of means, or magical, but an introduction to the historical salvation. But even now, in this preparatory stage, with the full use of means through instruction and education, a point is reached, where human help must cease, and those alone are made manifest as true disciples (μαθηταί), on whom the light of the Spirit moving in the word arises inwardly—for whom the lessons received from the word are inwardly interpreted, made illuminating, written on their hearts. Only an evil, hierarchical turn of mind regards with distrust this growth of an independent Christianity;* to a godly-minded instructor it is the greatest joy, when he detects it in those under his care (comp. John iv. 42). It is the Spirit bearing them witness that they have received a life from God, and shedding into their heart the love of God (Rom. v. 5; viii. 15, 16; 1 Cor. ii. 12; 1 John ii. 27; v. 6). It is a teaching, which is at the same time an influence, such as the law cannot exert. And, moreover, with the testimony that this is a Divine, holy, blessed, eternal life, there is joined an assurance that we have received this life from this source, and from none other. The witness of the Holy Ghost certifies to us that we are the children of God, and certifies us at the same time, that no otherwise do we become, or have we become so, than through being begotten of the incorruptible seed of the Divine word (James i. 18; 1 Pet. i. 23). In the last passage likewise there is connected with this an exhortation to brotherly love (v. 22); comp. 1 John v. 1.

3. (Vv. 10, 11.) We perceive the Apostle's deep insight in this, that, after the warning against covetousness, he now also directs his warning to the opposite side, that they who are careless and indifferent in things of earth may not fancy that they are in no danger. Above all, a still inexperienced spiritual character may easily degenerate into a certain vain perverseness. What is true in the matter of mutual exhortation is recognized by Paul (ch. v. 11); but it is something different, when a man pragmatically sets up for a guardian of souls, without warrant takes the brethren under his charge, gratuitously troubles himself about others—as if there were no longer need for us to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling. A singular instance of this perversity is given by the Apostle, 1 Tim. vi. 2. There is already a taint of unsoundness, when one connects the Christian character so closely with the outward appearance, that he values, for example, a simple, faithful nursery-maid less highly than he does a deaconess. It is not Christianity that is to be blamed for this, but the heart of man in its abuse of Christianity. True fidelity, again, in the care of other souls can proceed only from the man who looks well to his own.

4. With this fidelity in working out our own salvation the Apostle joins in particular, the faithful industry of humble labor in our earthly calling. He tolerates no neglect of the ordinary duty of labor under a spiritual pretext. A certain officiousness, which under pious pretences abandons itself to sloth, allowing itself to be supported by others, and giving most reasonable offence to worldly-minded persons, shows itself especially in great cities (VON GERLACH). (In the country people know one another more intimately.) Our passage is very important as pointing out the true position of the Christian in regard to the tasks of this earthly life. By example and exhortation Paul checks all shame of a false spirituality, all arrogant and sluggish pretension, as if Christians were too good to labor in the sweat of their face. He teaches us to recognize the worth of industry. True, the Christian should have his treasure and heart in heaven (Matt. vi. 19 sqq.); should not be bent on becoming rich (1 Tim. vi. 9; comp. v. 17 sqq.); should have as though he had not (1 Cor. vii. 29 sqq.); and yet he is not to suppose that he must flee out of the world (John xvii. 15); *in* the world to be kept from the evil, that is his aim; to seek, not worldly gain, but yet an economical independence; no *religiose vivere* in the hermit's sense (THEOPHYLACT: Is fasting, or sleeping on the ground, to work with the hands?); no morality without the religious foundation; but at the same time no religiousness without moral authentication. Such is the apostolical order. The moderns, perhaps, were not the first to set this light on the candlestick, but our Reformers restored it to its place (*bona opera juxta vocationem*). Faithful industry is a test of humility and sincerity, a means of discipline and self-control. The sons of Indian princes must on their conversion stand this test. The objection, that Christianity disqualifies for a life on earth, affects not Christianity itself, but merely its unwholesome corruptions. History shows what a blessed influence the Christian spirit has exerted in all the departments of human activity. This is shown in the largest sphere, and not less in the smallest and most inconspicuous. Indeed it is precisely in this devoted fidelity that a main proof must be given of a sincere Christian feeling.

5. The Apostle is possessed by an earnestly expectant hope in the coming of the Lord, and, even when his business is to calm the emotions, he can-

* [Of course, this must not be strained so far as to contradict 1 Cor. xii. 12–30; Eph. iv. 11–16; &c.—J. L.]

not do it by saying to them like the wicked servant (Matt. xxiv. 48): My Lord delayeth His coming. But what is great and admirable is the discretion with which, with all his liveliness of aspiration, he yet avoids all revolutionizing of this *αἰών*, and notwithstanding that he hopes for the Lord's coming as nigh at hand, nay, *on account of* this hope, he only the more insists on daily fidelity in earthly things (1 Cor. vii. 20 sqq.). "O world, thou art for us too small!" This he understands throughout not in any monkish, but in a sound and sober sense. Sobriety consists in never neglecting our daily duty—in being at all times faithful in ordinary, every-day, petty and extraneous concerns, not indeed because the material of our labor, but because the exercise of fidelity on that material is of importance for eternity. Two men working together in one field, two women at one mill—such is the order until the coming of the Lord. The difference, according to which they are taken or rejected, is in their inward spirit at their work.

6. (V. 12.) With worldly-minded persons the predominant consideration has respect to their equals. Christians inquire first, as to God, then as to the judgment of their brethren who have some understanding of Divine things, and lastly as to what others say;—*lastly;* and therefore they are not entirely indifferent to that. This were contrary to humility and wisdom, which are willing to be told a truth even by the malevolent; and it were also a violation of the missionary obligation, and consequently of love. ROOS: Give no occasion to those without to say, that faith in Christ makes idlers and beggars. Indeed, CHRYSOSTOM already mentions, that the heathen called healthy beggars *Χριστεμπόρους*. But not begging merely, a lazy enthusiasm also could not but discredit the gospel. This it was important to avoid. That the Church should be respected, that even her enemies should not be able to upbraid her with anything, and that no other reproach than that of Christ should rest on her (1 Pet. ii. 9, 12), is an advantage towards which every one must be careful to contribute his share, and a condition of a blessed outward efficiency. The gospel loes not destroy, but sanctifies, the delicate sense of honor and self-reliance—fostering the independence of a character which has its foundation in God. This is something quite different from a haughty severity, and is quite compatible with the simple acceptance of that which God, in a time of Divine visitation, presents also by the hand of brotherly love.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

V. 9. HEUBNER: Brotherly love was to be the most familiar thing for every Christian.—THEOPHYLACT: What is extremely important needs not to be taught; it is obvious to all.—*Berlenburger Bibel:* For what reason may the admonition about brotherly love follow that respecting continence? That we may understand it of no other than a pure love.—HEUBNER: The Christian is a genuine divine, taught by the Spirit, not formed merely by others' teaching.—THE SAME: He who does not practise what he knows, has learned nothing yet from God.—(*Berlenburger Bibel:* He knows it merely after the law and the letter, but not after the Spirit.)—THE SAME: Not until God takes us into His school do we learn anything aright.—His teaching is at the same time a conferring of strength, pleasure, impulse.

V. 10. Wisdom unites encouragement with incitement.—THEOPHYLACT: Halt not behind expectation under the idea that you are already perfect.—DIEDRICH: True love never satisfies itself, and would willingly be urged to ever higher performances.—STARKE: Thinkest thou that thou art already rich enough in love? Thou errest greatly, and art still weak in thy knowledge.—The debt of love is never fully paid off (Rom. xiii. 8). The further one gets, the greater becomes his task.—*Berlenburger Bibel:* They who dwell together are neighbors to one another. But true Christians do not confine their love so narrowly, but spread it abroad to all. God is essentially boundless Love; the love of believers is boundless through grace.

V. 11. VON GERLACH: The Christian should live more inwardly than outwardly. The inner quietness will then show itself also in a quiet, industrious life, in which each man cares first for himself and those belonging to him, before he will help others.—This is not selfishness, but fidelity in one's calling.—STARKE: The spiritual or inner Sabbath of souls.—The obligation to work exists also for the rich; for women.—RIEGER: A man's mere intentions about some matter give him more trouble than the business itself. The one ensnaring thought of a determination to become rich is more fatal to quietness, than hands full of necessary work.—THE SAME: Occupation and work are not hostile to quietness, but promotive of it.—[BARROW has two Sermons on this verse.—J. L.]

Vv. 11, 12. True honor, not in the first instance from men, but from God, and so at last from men also; כָּבוֹד, is an essential, weighty glory; *δόξα*, amongst men merely an empty show.—RIEGER: Oh what a great thing it would be, if we could only restore to men the true conception of honor, and divert them from much false seeking for honor in what is sheer vanity; so that one should seek his honor in quietness, in the education of the inner man of the heart (1 Pet. iii. 4). Carefulness to please God supplies a stronger motive to an honorable walk, than ever comes from inculcating ever so largely the desire of honor.

V. 12. The value of independence, not merely from a human, but from a Divine point of view. Abraham, Gen. xiv. 22 sqq.—*Berlenburger Bibel:* Whoever desires much from the world must be its slave; which is not becoming in the royal priesthood.

HEUBNER: Two reasons for industry: 1. The honor of Christianity before the world demands it; 2. A noble independence of human bondage exists not without it.—1 Thess. iv. 1–7 is the Epistle for the Sunday called *Reminiscere* [2d Sunday in Lent].

III.

Ch. IV. 13–V. 11.

Instruction and Exhortation in regard to the Coming of the Lord.

Ch. IV. 13–18.

1. They who have fallen asleep will rise again, and so at the Lord's Advent will suffer no loss.

13 But I would [we would][1] not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning
them which are asleep [those who are falling asleep],[2] that ye sorrow[3] not, even
14 as others [the rest also][4] which [who] have no hope. For if we believe that
Jesus died and rose again [arose],[5] even so them also which sleep in Jesus [so
15 also those who fell asleep through Jesus][6] will God bring with Him. For this
we say unto you by [in, ἐν] the word of the Lord, that we which are alive *and*
remain [who are living, who are being left over][7] unto the coming of the Lord
shall not prevent them which are asleep [shall in no wise precede those who fell
16 asleep].[8] For [Because, ὅτι] the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with
a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God [with voice
of arch., and with trumpet of G.],[9] and the dead in Christ shall rise [arise] first;
17 then we which are alive *and* remain [who are living, who are being left over][10]
shall be caught up together with them [shall together with them be caught
away][11] in the clouds [in clouds],[12] to meet the Lord[13] in the air [into the air];[14]
18 and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with
these words.

[1] V. 13.—All the uncials [and all the recent editors] give θελόμεν instead of the *Recepta* θέλω.

[2] V. 13.—A. B. Sin. give the rarer κοιμωμένων; the other majuscules, the more frequent κεκοιμημένων; only one manuscript of a late date has the aorist, as in vv. 14, 15. [κοιμωμένων = *are falling asleep* from time to time, comp. περιλειπόμενοι of vv. 15, 17;—or simply, *are sleeping;* so Am. Bible Union, Alford, Ellicott. Alford quotes the epitaph: ιερὸν ὕπλον κοιμᾶται.—J. L.]

[3] V. 13.—The subjunctive λυπῆσθε is given by B. Sin. and others; but λυπεῖσθε by A. and others. On ἵνα with the present indicative, see Winer, p. 259. Formerly all such places were corrected; at present we begin to recognize a carelessness in the later speech, the only question being, whether it shows itself as early as the Apostle's time, or is chargeable on the copyists.

[4] V. 13.—[καὶ οἱ λοιποί. The καί belongs to οἱ λοιποί as one member of the comparison, not, as might be inferred from our Common Version, to καθώς.—J. L.]

[5] V. 14.—[ἀνέστη. Only in a few instances out of a large number is ἀνίστημι in our Version "to raise up *again*," "to rise *again*." Comp. v. 16; Rom. xiv. 9; &c.—J. L.]

[6] V. 14.—[οὕτως καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς κοιμηθέντας διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. *Revision:* "The aorist here and at v. 15 implies a backward look from the time of the resurrection, when of each one of the departed it may be said, as of Stephen (Acts vii. 60): ἐκοιμήθη. Comp. also E. V. Acts xiii. 36 and 2 Pet. iii. 4.—For the connection of διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, see the Exegetical Notes.—In this verse Sin.[1] has ἐπιστεύομεν, but this is corrected in Sin.[2]—J. L.]

[7] V. 15.—[οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι—comp. the temporal import of κοιμωμένων, v. 13, in Note 2 above. Here, in questionable, but convenient, modern English phrase: *are being left over*, as our brethren in Christ successively depart.—περιλειπ.; in the New Testament only here.—J. L.]

[8] V. 15.—[οὐ μὴ φθάσωμεν τοὺς κοιμηθέντας. For the double negative, see E. V. Matt. v. 18, and often elsewhere. German: *durchaus nicht.*—For the force of the aorist participle, see Note 6 above.—J. L.]

[9] V. 16.—[These nouns are anarthrous in Greek; and the indefiniteness is just as allowable and as expressive in English.—Worthy of note also is the Greek arrangement of the whole clause: "Because the Lord Himself with a shout, with voice of archangel, and with trumpet of God, shall descend from heaven."—J. L.]

[10] V. 17.—[The same phrase as in v. 15 (though Sin. has here περιλιπόμενοι). See there Note 7.—J. L.]

[11] V. 17.—[ἅμα σὺν αὐτοῖς ἁρπαγησόμεθα. *Revision:* "The direction is determined, not by the verb, but by εἰς ἀέρα." Comp. Matt. xiii. 19; Acts viii. 39; &c.—J. L.]

[12] V. 17.—[ἐν νεφέλαις, as in Mark xiii. 26.—J. L.]

[13] V. 17.—[Literally: *unto meeting of the Lord;* German, *zur Begegnung des Herrn.*—J. L.]

[14] V. 17.—[εἰς ἀέρα—connected with ἁρπαγησόμεθα. Riggenbach follows the modern German versions in changing Luther's *in der Luft* into *in die Luft*. And similarly Alford, Ellicott (the Commentary—to which, however, the Translation, as occasionally happens, is not conformed), Vaughan, &c.—J. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. (V. 13.) **But we would not have you to be ignorant, &c.**—This or some kindred phrase is frequently used by Paul, when he would introduce some new and important instruction (1 Cor. x. 1; xii. 1; Col. ii. 1; Phil. i. 12); occasionally also in communicating something personal, in which he feels a special interest (Rom. i. 13). Here in particular he now begins to supply their deficiencies (ch. iii. 10) in respect of knowledge; in a very kindly spirit, in a way not of rebuke but of encouragement, there being no occasion for him to censure any deliberate perverseness. With a lively transition (as in 1 Cor. v. and xii. and frequently) he leads *in medias res*. The Thessalonians perhaps had asked a question, or Timothy may have given information respecting their uneasiness about some of their number who had died. Whether these were many or few, or even none at all, so that they were troubled merely by the imminent peril of death, they had no clearness of view as to their fate. On the connection

with what goes before, see on ch. iv. 9–12 the Exegetical Note 4. Formerly HOFMANN likewise so understood the matter; now (since what follows is not instruction generally respecting Christ's return, but merely a consolatory addition with regard to those asleep) he rather assumes as the connecting thought their brotherly love in its anxiety about the departed. *That ye sorrow not*, he says; not: *that ye be not excited*. Ch. v., however, adds still another admonition to sobriety. In questions of this sort no decision of exclusive validity can be hit upon.—**Those who have fallen asleep** (perfect), or **those who are falling asleep** (present; *who are continually going to sleep*;—as afterwards: *the living, who are being left over*, continually); so he calls the dead, by a gentle euphemism, 1 Cor. xi. 30 (present); xv. 20 (perfect). Comp. Soph. *El.* 509; then the Septuagint Is. xliii. 17 for שָׁכַב; Job iii. 13, for יָשַׁן; Dan. xii. 2, Septuagint καθεύδειν. But it is more than merely an expression to veil a terrible reality, nor does it denote merely the refreshment of rest, deliverance from earthly trouble; on the contrary, it is the promise of an awaking, now especially that there is an Awakener (John xi. 11). We are not to think of a sleep of the soul, an entire unconsciousness. The figure is taken from the body, a dead man resembling one asleep. ZWINGLI, CALVIN and others oppose with reason the Psychopannychians, whose dogma expressly contradicts other passages—the parable, Luke xvi. 19 sqq.; the promise, Luke xxiii. 43 (*To-day!*); the apostolic statements, 2 Cor. v. 8; Phil. i. 23; Rev. xiv. 13 (*Blessed from henceforth—with the Lord*). Even here the circumstance that Paul opposes to their sorrowfulness the resurrection, and only with this connects the being with Christ (v. 17), by no means implies that those asleep in Christ are not yet blessed, or are not with Christ, as Phil. i. expressly teaches. He looks beyond the intermediate state, because he would offer the entire fulness of consolation, and that with reference to the anxieties of the Thessalonians, of which Note 4 will speak.

2. **That ye sorrow not, even as the rest** (of men, those not Christians) **also** (in comparisons, see v. 5) &c., λυποῦνται; **who have no hope.** Here he speaks not exclusively of the heathen, as in v. 5: *who know not God*. In Eph. ii. 12, indeed, it is specially the heathen whom he describes as strangers to Israel's promises, having no hope (in the widest sense, with reference to all Messianic promises), and without God in the world. Israel, on the contrary, had promises and therefore also hopes, and if the Sadducees rejected these, there is yet in that place no thought of them. There is indeed, however, still a difference between having the promises and the acual living holding fast of the hope, and it is not merely among the heathen that the latter is wanting. Even supposing that he has them especially in his eye, it is yet not without reason that the expression is kept general. But the Apostle does not require that Christians shall not sorrow at all (LÜNEMANN: because the phrase is not, μὴ τοσοῦτον ὡς*), but simply: their sorrow should not be of the same sort as, etc. (καθώς, as in Eph. iv. 17. HOFMANN [WORDSWORTH, after AUGUSTINE; and so most.—J. L.]).

3. (V. 14.) **For if we believe,** &c.—He thus gives the reason why they should not sorrow in a heathenish way; εἰ is not used in the sense of *siquidem*, but the hypothetical turn just so much the more challenges their assent: *if*, as we at least have no difficulty in believing (ch. i. 3, 10; ii. 13); if we not merely hold it to be true, but build thereon with confidence (the meaning of πιστεύειν), making it the foundation of our life;—from this he then draws the conclusion, from which we in our ready despondency hang back.—**That Jesus** (he uses the human name) **died** (here not, *fell asleep*, but without any disguise he speaks of *death*). And did not every one believe that? Certainly we are not to assume here (with some Greek interpreters) a caution against a Docetic denial of the bodily death. Christ's death and resurrection are really to him the two inseparable pillars of the faith: *He died* (for us, ch. v. 10), and what more? did he remain in death? no! died **and arose**; as the Firstfruit (1 Cor. xv. 20), He brought to light a victorious life. But he arose out of death, was not glorified without passing through death; not even Christ.—**So also those who,** &c. Οὕτως is not simply a sign of the apodosis (OLSHAUSEN), any more than it is so at v. 17, but: *so, as the Crucified arose* (Rev. xi. 5); or: *so, as the consequence of that* (Rom. v. 12); still better: *so, as made like Him in death and resurrection;—God will bring them with Jesus;* it is not said: *He will awake them.** The turn which the apodosis takes is concise and forcible, the clause, *if we believe*, being followed, not by another of the subjective kind: *so we believe also*, but objectively, by a matter of fact: *so God will do thus and thus*. If this faith of ours is the truth, if on this truth of God we firmly rely, then it follows, &c. Otherwise KOCH and HOFMANN; *if we believe* expresses, they think, a condition: *then, in that case, so will God*—that is, bring with Jesus those who in this faith have fallen asleep. But this is a harsher incongruity than what HOFMANN censures in the other explanation; it must then have been said: So will He, when we fall asleep, awaken *us*.—It is still disputed, to what διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ belongs. Almost all the moderns (DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN, HOFMANN, and others) refer it to ἄξει, as being unsuited to κοιμηθέντας, which would require ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, as at v. 16 ἐν Χριστῷ, and so 1 Cor. xv. 18; and because to say that ἐν stands for διά [διά for ἐν. So JOWETT still; also WEBSTER and WILKINSON.—J. L.], and both for בְּ, is obsolete. But ἄξει has already its more precise specification in σὺν αὐτῷ, and with κοιμηθέντας it is desirable to find their Christian character, not merely indicated by the context, but expressly declared (opposed to the view of KOCH and HOFMANN). The meaning, moreover, may well be this: *those who fell asleep through Jesus, whose falling asleep is through the medtation of Jesus* [WEBSTER and WILKINSON: τοῦ Ἰησοῦ—the article referring emphatically to Jesus as presented in the first member, Jesus who died and rose again.—J. L.]; so CHRYSOSTOM, LUTHER, CALVIN, GROTIUS, BENGEL, HILGENFELD, and others.† *He will bring them with*

* [ALFORD, ELLICOTT, WEBSTER and WILKINSON, agree with LÜNEMANN; of course, without denying the lawfulness of such sorrow as is spoken of in John xi. 35, Phil. ii. 27, &c. They understand the Apostle to be thinking solely of a sorrow occasioned by the apprehension that death is in some way a calamity to believers, and *that* sorrow he forbids absolutely.—J. L.]

* [ALFORD errs in making the bringing of departed saints = "their being raised when Jesus appears." Their resurrection is *implied* in their being brought.—J. L.]

† [Several, as MUSCULUS, ARETIUS, HAMMOND, TILLOTSON, &c., unduly restrict the reference, as if martyrs only were meant: *who fell asleep on account of Jesus, for Jesus'*

Him (Jesus)—this many take as pregnant for (*awaken and*) *bring*. (Through Jesus as Mediator God effects the work of quickening, John v. and vi.) But it is still simpler, if we understand *οὕτως* as above explained: *so He will bring them, when conformed to Jesus in death and resurrection, along with Him* (as the Shepherd, whither He goes); LUTHER: *thither, where Jesus abides;* ROOS: *to glory, to rest, to the goal of their hope;* STARKE: *with Him, when He shall come to judgment;* HOFMANN: *when He brings Jesus into the world again* (Heb. i. 6), *He will bring them, cause them to come, along with Jesus, will let them share in His heavenly manifestation.* How he comes at this *ἄγειν*, is shown vv. 16, 17.

4. (V. 15.) **For** (to explain) **this we say unto you**, etc.—He thus illustrates what was said in v. 14, first negatively (v. 15), then positively (vv. 16, 17). *This* (what follows) *we say unto you* **in a word of the Lord;** *ἐν*, as in 1 Cor. ii. 7, marks the medium in which the discourse moves; not in *my* words do I speak; my statement confines itself within the sphere of a word of the Lord; comp. for the matter 1 Cor. vii. 10, 12, 25, and for the expression 1 Kings xx. 35, בִּדְבַר יְהוָֹה, lxx. PELT supposes him to refer to Matt. xxiv. 31; to which EWALD adds Luke xiv. 14; HOFMANN, Matt. xvi. 27 sq.; ZWINGLI and others, Matt. xxv. 1 sqq., John v. 28 sq. THEOPHYLACT and CALVIN think of a word orally utered by Christ, and so probably a *λόγος ἄγραφος*, like Acts xx. 35. But such a one is in that place introduced differently; and not one of the texts cited makes the special disclosure that here follows, respecting the relation between the dead and those still living. It is therefore more correct to think (with CHRYSOSTOM and other Greeks, BENGEL, OLSHAUSEN, DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN) of a revelation from the exalted Lord, an *ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ μυστηρίου* (Chrysostom, it is true, adduces not only 2 Cor. xiii. 3 on one side, but also Acts xx. 35 on the other). At 1 Cor. xv. 51 also Paul says something similar on a similar occasion; comp. Gal. i. 12; Rom. xi. 25.—**That we who are living** (here: in the earthly body), according to the more precise explanation: **who remain over** (are left over by God) **unto the coming** (return) **of the Lord** (that is: who live to see that coming), **shall in no wise precede those who fell asleep:** *οὐ μή* in the New Testament indifferently with the aorist subjunctive or the future indicative; WINER, § 56, 3. This coming (1 Cor. xv. 23) is coincident with Matt. xxiv. 31; Rev. xix. 11 sqq.; xx. 5 (not xx. 11 sqq.). Here we learn to understand the trouble of the Thessalonians. They sorrowed on the supposition that whoever does not live to see the Advent suffers loss (in the Fourth [in the English Apocrypha, the Second] Book of Esdras, ch. vi. 13, we meet with such ideas; see WIESELER, *Chronol. der apost. Zeitalters*, p. 250). But how did they conceive of this loss? Evidently LÜNEMANN goes too far, when from the words: *Ye are not to sorrow as they who have no hope*, he (as CALVIN and others before him) draws the inference that they believed in no life at all after death, and supposed that the dying were absolutely excluded from the kingdom. That does not lie in the comparison, any more than v. 5: "Indulge not in lust, *even as the Gentiles who know not God*," charges them with not knowing God; rather, *Because* ye know Him, be not like those who know Him *not*." And so here: "Sorrow not as those who have *no* hope; ye *do* have a hope." He then reasons, as in 1 Cor. xv., from the connection between Christ and believers, the Head and His members, as an indissoluble unity: "The Head cannot forsake His members." He does not in this imply the existence of any deniers of the resurrection, as at Corinth; what we allow is simply that they suffered from dimness of apprehension. To the Greeks generally the resurrection was a difficult topic (Acts xvii.). The Thessalonians, indeed, expected with firm faith the coming of the Lord (ch. i. 10; and in ch. iv. also it is presupposed). But the significance and operation of that event they did not duly perceive. They seem with Grecian fancy to have taken up the idea of the outward splendor of the appearance, without considering with sufficient earnestness that the Crucified One, who arose from the dead, will come again; the Conqueror of sin and death. Paul therefore reminds them of this fundamental truth, and thence infers that we shall not precede those fallen asleep, shall not be admitted to the Lord earlier than they. It is only by ingenuity that LÜNEMANN can here hold fast to his idea: Paul, he thinks, is engaged with the figure of a race, where those who are outstripped, and have to lay behind in mid course, do not reach the goal at all. But Paul does not intimate that he has here any thought of this figure; and besides, such a preoccupying of salvation, as would deprive others of it, is not within the compass of truth. This were a one-sided pressing of the figure of a race, that would turn it into an untruth. Rather, in saying: *We shall not anticipate the dead*, he lets us see that the Thessalonians cherished such an idea; but that this leaves open all the while an undefined prospect at least for the later comers. But what prospect? On this point their view is not clear to us, perhaps was not so even to themselves. OLSHAUSEN, DE WETTE, HOFMANN and others suppose that they had no doubt about the resurrection at the final consummation, only they did not distinguish between the first and the second resurrections; that, in fact, they knew nothing of the first resurrection (of the just), of the hailing of the returning Lord by His risen ones, and of their fellowship with Him during the glorious period preceding the general judgment; that their idea was, that in the kingdom just at hand the dead would have no part; that, however, they really believed in the remote, final resurrection after the kingdom of glory, but found in that no living consolation. Still it is by no means clear how they should have mastered and believed in such a precise arrangement of all the stages of the last things (Advent, Kingdom of glory, Last Resurrection) with only the single exception of the First Resurrection at the Advent; nor yet how the Last Resurrection should have been of so little consequence in their estimation. Are we, then, to be driven back on LÜNEMANN? Not that either; but we suppose that Paul had powerfully preached in Thessalonica the coming of Christ to set up His kingdom, but had not had time to enter into all questions of detail. Now the Thessalonians, with

sake. Others, as MICHAELIS, SCOTT, BARNES, ALFORD, WORDSWORTH, ELLICOTT, VAUGHAN, &c., make the idea to be that *through Jesus* the death of Christians is rightly accounted a *sleep*. ELLICOTT, however, allows that which of the two connections is the right one "must remain to the last an open question." It is in favor of that with *ἄξει*, that both in the Bible, and in profane literature, classical as well as modern, the figure of sleep is used for death in general; and that the other connection would rather have had: *τοὺς διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ κοιμηθέντας*. See my note in the *Revision*.—J. L.]

a lively impression of this message, had yet a rather dim, worldly understanding of it, from their conceiving of every miraculous occurrence as rather simply an exhibition of power, and not duly considering that the path lies through death to resurrection, through decease to the new life. To be gathered unto the Lord (as even in Matt. xxiv. 31 the resurrection is not expressly named)—for them this desire absorbed everything. Whoever lives not to see that, he suffers loss—such was their thought. They did not, like the Corinthians, deny the resurrection of the dead, for the Apostle certainly does not reprove them as he does those; and quite as little perhaps can it be asserted so positively as OLSHAUSEN assumes, that they believed only in the last resurrection; but whether there was anything, and what, still to be expected for the dead, this was to them an obscure matter; their whole hope and aspiration was bent on the one point, to remain exempt from death;—the thing that Paul likewise desired (2 Cor. v. 4), but not so partially. This anxiety was such as could be felt only in the first period of instruction still imperfectly apprehended. (See the Introduction, p. 12. On *we who are living*, see Exeg. Note 7.)

5. (V. 16.) **For He Himself, the Lord*** [**Because the Lord Himself**], &c. *For*, not *that* (KOCH); † he shows how there is no such thing as *φθάνειν*. DE WETTE and HOFMANN would here, as at ch. iii. 11, understand merely: *He, the Lord;* but here, as there, the Apostle makes an emphatic antithesis both of subjects and predicates; not: "*We* shall first come to *Him*," but: "*He Himself* will *descend*," otherwise no one at all would come to Him. Ἐν signifies *in, with, attended by*, as 1 Cor. iv. 21; Rom. xv. 29. Κέλευσμα (another form, κέλευμα) LUTHER translates *Feldgeschrei* [war-cry], and understands by it the joyful exclamation of the angelic host, "the van and guards;" English Bible: *with a shout;* but more correctly the Vulgate: *in jussu;* for the word signifies a shout of command, proceeding from the leading huntsman, or from the pilot of a ship, requiring the rowers to keep time, or from a charioteer, or a general; Prov. xxx. 27, Sept.; also Thucydides ii. 92: ἀπὸ ἑνὸς κελεύσματος ἐμβοήσαντες, where κελ. does not denote the battle-cry of the combatants, but the meaning is that at a word of command they shouted. Christ is, therefore, described as a victorious Captain, whose order summons to battle, for the destruction of His enemies and the extermination of the antichristian power (2 Thess. ii.; Rev. xix. 11 sqq.). To this is added: **with the voice of an archangel,** summoning the other angels, the great hosts of heavenly spirits, who sympathize in man's salvation, coöperating at the giving of the law (Acts vii. 53; Gal. iii. 19) and afterwards at the judgment (Matt. xiii. 41; xxiv. 31; xxv. 31); which last event brings a consummation also for themselves (Eph. i. 10). In canonical Scripture the archangel Michael appears again only at Jude 9; Gabriel is not so called, nor the seven angels before God (Rev. viii. 2 = Tob. xii. 15). Yet to the name *archangel, prince of angels*, corresponds the designation שָׂרִים, *ἄρχοντες*, Dan. x. 13, 20; and already Josh. v. 14, שַׂר־צְבָא־יְהוָה, Sept. *ἀρχιστράτηγος δυνάμεως κυρίου.* By the archangel AMBROSIASTER [JEREMY TAYLOR] and OLSHAUSEN would understand Christ, the Lord of angels; others still more unsuitably, the Holy Spirit; but he must be an angel, the highest amongst the angels, answering to the high priest as compared with the priests. Lastly, **with a trumpet of God** (the last, 1 Cor. xv. 52); this is not merely a *nota superlativi, the very great*, though it is indeed the Divine, and not a human, majesty that is antithetically described; but, besides that, we are to understand it thus: which is used by God's command, in God's service, which belongs to Him; DE WETTE compares κιθάρας τοῦ θεοῦ, Rev. xv. 2. What should it be? How will it sound? is not to be searched out. The future reality is depicted in images of present reality. It will be heard, as the sign will be seen, Matt. xxiv. 27, 30. As to its import, it is the conclusive echo of Sinai, the highest form of all the signals, whereby the people are called together before the Lord, that by which the enemy's stronghold, mightier than Jericho, falls (Num. x.; Is. xxvii. 13; Zech. ix. 14; Rev. viii. Seven trumpets). This is not a mere notion of Jewish Rabbis, but the prophetic word receives apostolic sanction. LÜNEMANN and HOFMANN would understand the archangel's voice and the trumpet as in apposition to *κέλευσμα*,* but without reason. [WITSIUS, after GROTIUS, identifies the archangel's voice with the trumpet as blown by him.—J. L.] We have rather to recognize three particulars, following each other in rapid succession: the Commander's call of the King Himself; the voice of the archangel summoning the other angels; the trumpet, which awakes the dead, and collects the believers. [Dr. JOHN DICK: "Three sounds are distinctly mentioned, but I do not pretend to know what they are."—J. L.]

The descent from heaven presupposes the ascension thither (Acts i. 11). **And the dead in Christ shall arise first;** *ἐν Χριστῷ*, though without the article, belongs to *οἱ νεκροὶ* (WINER, § 20, 2). He speaks here only of the resurrection of the just (Luke xiv. 14), *τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ* at His coming (1 Cor. xv. 23), who have died in the Lord (Rev. xiv. 13), *qui in Christi corpore continentur* (CALVIN); not of all without distinction arising in Christ. The correction in Codd. F. G., *οἱ νεκροὶ οἱ* is not at all necessary. The same Codd. together with D.¹ read (instead of πρῶτον) πρῶτοι; Itala and Vulgate, *primi*, which is altogether unsuitable, for the contrast here is not (as THEOPHYLACT and others suppose) between such as rise first and others who do not rise till afterwards; but between what will take place first (the resurrection of those who fell asleep in faith), and what next (*ἔπειτα*) occurs in the case of the living.

6. (V. 17.) **Then we &c. shall together with them be snatched away, caught away;** has-

* [*Denn er selbst, der Herr;*—so RIGGENBACH and others after LUTHER; but erroneously.—J. L.]

† [Who connects with *λέγομεν* of v. 15.—J. L.]

* [And so Bishop HALL, OLSHAUSEN, JOWETT, ALFORD, ELLICOTT. I do not perceive why this view should be reckoned "more plausible" (ELLICOTT) than the other. It might much rather be said to be inferior in martial precision and grandeur. See the note of WEBSTER and WILKINSON. In favor of ascribing the *κέλευσμα* to the Lord Himself, they refer to the parallel of the delivery of the law, where, besides the ministry and voice of angels, the sound of the trumpet, and the fire, we have also the voice of God (Ex. xix. 16, 18, 19; xx. 18, 19; Deut. iv. 12, 15, 33; v. 4, 22-26; &c.); likewise to John v. 28, 29; Heb. xii. 19, 20, 25-27; Job xiv. 12-15; Ps. l. 1-6; Matt. xiii. 30, 41; xxiv. 31. So Milton:

"The Son gave signal high,
To the bright minister that watch'd; he blew
His trumpet, heard in Oreb since perhaps
When God descended; and perhaps once more
To sound at general doom." *Par. L.*, B. xi.—J. L.]

tily, swiftly, irresistibly, by the overpowering might of God; this lies in the expression (also 2 Cor. xii. 2, though in a different application); **in (on)*** **clouds,** as one received the Lord (Acts i.); not *into the clouds* (εἰς), but *in the clouds* (inwrapped), or *on them* (throned, as on chariots of God; CHRYSOSTOM); comp. Matt. xxiv. 30; xxvi. 64; Rev. xi. 12; xiv. 14; **unto meeting** of the Lord, לִקְרָאת; instead of ἀπάντ. τοῦ κυρίου others (weaker authorities) give ὑπάντ. τῷ Χριστῷ. Both words, ἀπάντησις or ὑπάντησις, govern the genitive (Matt. xxv. 1) or (like the verb) the dative (Acts xxviii. 15). CHRYSOSTOM and other Greeks: "to meet Christ, as persons of distinction meet a king to salute him, while others must wait for him, as criminals for the judge." For the matter, 2 Thess. ii. 1 is to be compared. It is a description, so to speak, of the Church's Ascension, in which the Head brings His members to Himself. Possibly the clouds here, as in Acts i., indicate a veiling of the transaction. But at any rate this rapture necessarily presupposes the previous sudden change (1 Cor. xv. 52; 2 Cor. v. 2 sqq.), which is here only not expressly mentioned, but without which a soaring away into the air were not conceivable. Only by means of the glorified corporeity (Phil. iii. 21) can such an event take place. LUTHER (appealing to Heb. ix. 27) insists that all men must once die, that is, leave this life and enter another. For those left over, therefore [*die* "*Ueberlinge*," as if we should say, *the overlings*.—J. L.], the change would be their death. These shall not sleep, but in a twinkling will die and live again.—**And so** (as those who have been caught away into the air, the risen and changed ones, or, still better: as those who have thus met Him) **shall we ever be with the Lord**; HOFMANN: continually, not meeting with Him merely in transient or occasionally repeated salutation; σύν expresses the intimate union, μετά simply outward companionship. This is the main point of comfort which he had in view: *to be with the Lord*, inseparably united to Him. Thus we reach the ἄγειν σὺν αὐτῷ (v. 14), the marriage supper of the Lamb (Rev. xix. 7–9). But it is not in the air that this being ever with Christ takes place (as PELT, USTERI, WEITZEL think, with a quite mistaken appeal to Eph. ii. 2: the air as the region of spirits, but of evil spirits!). Only the meeting takes place in the air, not the abiding. Already AUGUSTINE (*De Civ. Dei*, xx. 20, 2) saw the truth: *Venienti ibitur obviam, non manenti.* The Lord is come from heaven, but not quite to the earth, so that a rapture into the air leads to His presence. He comes to fetch them (John xiv. 2, 3) into the heavenly kingdom (2 Tim. iv. 18), which is so called, not merely because it is of a heavenly quality, and even the earth receives a heavenly glory, but because at the coming it really transports the glorified into heaven; they shall be with Him, as BENGEL says, *non modo in aëre, sed in cœlo unde venit.* Others think of a coming with Him to the earth to judgment. HILGENFELD thinks that the meeting is followed by the coming with Him to the glorified earth. But that may even be reserved† for a later date. In fact, the description is not one that exhausts all particulars; it is carried only so far as is necessary to make it clear, that the dead shall be in no way inferior to those who survive. (See the Doctrinal and Ethical Notes, 5.)

7. (Vv. 15, 17.) **We who are living, who are being left over.**—Here Paul evidently reckons himself among those of whom he considers it possible, and a thing to be desired and hoped for, that they may live to witness the Advent; just so 1 Cor. xv. 51 sqq. (according to the correct reading of the *text. rec.*, and also of the Cod. Vat.).* The strange evasions, by means of which the Fathers and others sought to make out, that Paul nevertheless is not speaking of himself, are justly set aside by LÜNEMANN. (To this class belongs the explanation of ŒCUMENIUS, that the dead are the bodies, the living are the souls; &c.) Nor ought it to be imputed to him, that he uses ἡμεῖς merely in the way of *communicatio* (THEOPHYLACT: representing in his own person all who shall then be living), though knowing that he will not be present; of this knowledge we see nothing, rather a hope inconsistent with it. But it were just as inconsiderate to say bluntly, that the Apostle's expectation has been plainly convicted by the event as erroneous; as if thus the whole eschatological prediction collapsed. In that case, indeed, Paul would be a false prophet (Deut. xviii. 20 sqq.), and his appeal to the Lord's word an untruth. This word of the Lord, as even LÜNEMANN allows, told him only generally in what relation the dead would stand to those surviving, not who belongs to each of the two classes; it was, therefore, not: "Thou, Paul, shalt be of the number;" otherwise he could not again have spoken doubtfully on the point at Phil. i. 21 sqq.; ii. 17; 2 Cor. v. 9, and in still a different tone at 2 Tim. iv. 6. Altogether, just as here, in speaking of those who live to the Advent, he says ἡμεῖς by *communicatio* in the sense of hope (GROTIUS: *putavit fieri posse*), he elsewhere says as freely by *communicatio* on the opposite side: "God will raise *us* up," 1 Cor. vi. 14 (this alongside of ch. xv. 51); 2 Cor. iv. 14; comp. 1 Thess. v. 10; Acts xx. 29. He expressly reminds us at ch. v. 1 sqq., that we know not the times and the seasons, and were not to know them; as the Lord declares even of Himself in his condition of self-denial (Mark xiii. 32), and as He represents to his Apostles (Acts i. 7). Had he meant to set it down as certain: *I shall not die*, that would really have been at least a knowledge of the χρόνοι; and not less so, had he asserted: *I shall die before that, it will not happen in my time.* Moreover, if ἡμεῖς expressed the definite expectation: *I shall yet be there*, it must equally follow that to all his readers of that age included with himself in ἡμεῖς he makes the promise, that they shall live till the Advent; which were indeed utterly absurd. Rather, he opposes the two classes to each other; here those asleep, and on the other side the living, those remaining over; he himself, of course, is among the living; but both classes are in a state of constant flux. What did not come to pass in the case of Paul and his cotemporaries, then holds good for those who follow after, and shall actually live till the Advent. Certainly the Apostles do all of them ex-

* [*auf*—a useless variation, not justified here by the ἐπί, in a similar connection, of other texts.—J. L.]

† [Of course, this is quite compatible with the previous idea, of a coming with Christ to judgment, and that the latter is a scriptural representation there can be no doubt; comp. Is. xxxii. 1; Dan. vii. 9, 10; Zech. xiv. 5; 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3; Rev. ii. 26, 27; iii. 21; xx. 4; &c. It is also worth noting that, as I remarked in the *Lectures*, "there are only three other places in the New Testament where the phrase here translated *to meet* occurs; and in all of them (Matt. xxv. 1, 6; Acts xxviii. 15) the party met continues after the meeting to advance still in the direction in which he was moving previously."—J. L.]

* [Whereas Sin. agrees with A. C. F. G.: πάντες μὲν κοιμηθησόμεθα, οὐ πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγ.—J. L.]

press often enough the expectation of the Coming as near; *e. g.*, 1 Pet. iv. 7; 1 John ii. 18; James v. 8; and Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 29 sqq.; Rom. xiii. 11, 12; Phil. iv. 5; this, however, not as a dogma whereby the ignorance of the χρόνοι would be removed, but merely as a living hope and longing expectation. See HÖLEMANN, *Die Stellung St. Pauli zu der Frage um die Zeit der Wiederkunft Christi*, Leipzig, 1858; and the Doctrinal and Ethical Notes, 6.

8. (V. 18.) **Wherefore comfort one another with these words;** ὥστε with a following imperative also at Phil. iv. 1; and so διό, ch. v. 11. The comfort should check the sorrowing (v. 13); *with these words*, which rest on the word of the Lord, not *rationibus*, *argumentis*, but simply the words of the evangelical message.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. (V. 13.) It is not sorrow altogether for the dying that Paul forbids; he rather takes it for granted that they will have to sorrow; only let it not be as the sorrow of the hopeless. Nowhere does Scripture overstrain unnaturally its demand, as if death should cause no pang. It merely rebukes despondency, as if God were not God, and home were not home. But strength of faith is not a thing to be commanded, nor can its triumph be enforced.* Christ Himself shed tears, and Paul knew what it is to sorrow even for the dying (Phil. ii. 27). On the whole (STARKE): The believers of the Old Testament and of the New wept and sorrowed, but within such limits as the law already prescribed (Lev. xix. 28; Deut. xiv. 1), and the light of faith illustrates. The Apostle requires no Stoic insensibility, no icy hardness. CALVIN: "*aliud est frænare dolorem nostrum, ut subjiciatur Deo, aliud abjecto humano sensu instar lapidum obdurescere.*" And for this reason hope is an important element of the Christian life; ch. i. 3; Rom. v. 2–5; viii. 24 sqq.; 1 Cor. xiii.

2. The rest, who have no hope, are in the widest sense all who stand not in Christ, the only Source and Guarantee of true life. In the Old Testament is the sound of many lamentations over the life in the shadowy realm, as being no life, but as gloomy as in the Homeric songs (Is. xxxviii. 18 sq.; Ps. vi. 6 [5]; lxxxviii. 11–13 [10–12]; cxv. 17; Job x. 21 [and 22]; &c.); not because the right conception is still wanting, but because the actual curse of death is not yet broken. The gleams of prophetic hope (Ps. xvi. 9 sqq.; xlix. 16 [15]; Prov. xiv. 32; xv. 24; xxiii. 14; Is. xxvi. 19; Hos. xiii. 14; Dan. xii. 2) are first realized through Christ. But it is especially the heathen, of whom the Apostle's judgment holds good. It might, indeed, be a question here, as at v. 5, whether he does not assert too much. For do we not find among all nations some hope of immortality? and among the philosophers, as Socrates, Plato, &c., elevated thoughts on that topic, and arguments in its favor? True; but, measured by the full resurrection-life, what a state of death is that which the heathen call the other life! And how isolated is the more cheerful hope, how slender its thread, how feeble its knowledge, for the very reason that it is founded, not on the actings of God, but on disputable, more or less problematical arguments, accessible only to the refined thinker. How weak are the *Consolationes* of a Cicero, Seneca, Plutarch! nothing but probabilities. Even now observation shows how those who do not rely on the written word, and, inquiring merely about the immortality of the soul, would thus simply recognize a permanent separation of soul and body (though this would be a permanent reign of death),—how these persons with all their arguments never get the better of their doubts; nay, how more and more the most decided amongst them no longer have or allow *any* hope. It were easy to bring together a number of disconsolate sayings from the classics; for example, Æschylus, *Eumen.* 638 (648): ἅπαξ θανόντος οὔτις ἔστ' ἀνάστασις. Theocritus, *Idyll.* 4, 42: ἐλπίδες ἐν ζωοῖσιν, ἀνέλπιστοι δὲ θανόντες. Catullus, 5, 4: *Soles occidere et redire possunt: Nobis, cum semel occidit brevis lux, Nox est perpetua una dormienda.* STARKE: In Plutarch's time people mocked at the ἐλπιστικούς. It was an affected witticism of the dying Vespasian: *væ, puto deus fio.* And this is as it should be; it is proper that we should not get to be certain of our personality, until we are sure of our God and Saviour. On this true basis, however, Scripture regards as normal the undivided life, when the spirit and the body are together; being equally remote from materialism, which seeks in matter for the root and strength of all spiritual life, and from idealism, which sees the most perfect spirituality in being released from the body. The glorified body as the perfect organ of the ruling spirit—this is the reëstablishment and consummation of the condition originally designed by God (Phil. iii. 21). LUTHER: We shall again receive enriched and improved that which we lost in Adam; for we should have had it in Paradise (*Works*, ed. Walch, xii. 2628).

3. Death a sleep; STARKE: (1) Because in both the body rests, the soul remains alive; (2) because from both the body also awakes; (3) because both are a desirable release from trouble and toil; (4) because after both we again joyously salute and wish one another good morning.—Still the likeness exists only for faith, not for sight. According to what is visible, the word of triumph: "O death, where is thy sting?" sounds frequently like a scoff. DIEDRICH: The death of those dear to us still confronts us often as a frightful mystery.—Not only does the Old Testament call him *the king of terrors* [Job xviii. 14], his name in the New Testament also is still *the last enemy*. A natural horror in the presence of death is expressed by the Apostle himself in 2 Cor. v., and is seen in Gethsemane.* Corruption wears a different aspect from sleep. So much the greater must the Awakener appear to us.

4. (V. 15.) Paul appeals to a word of the Lord, like the old prophets (1 Sam. iii. 21; Is. i. 10; Jer. i. 2); not as one who steals and deceitfully gives out the Lord's word (Jer. xiv. 14; xxiii. 30); not as one who has merely adopted rabbinical opinions. (Whence, indeed, have the Rabbins the substance of their doctrine?) Nor does he speak in heaped-up images of a transcendental vision (when he really had such a one, with what modest reserve does he speak of it! 2 Cor. xii.); but his words have a clear

* [Whatever is matter of duty is properly matter of precept; Eph. vi. 10; 1 Thess. v. 16. Faith's brightest triumph is amidst the tears and struggles of nature; Ps. xxii. 4.—J. L.]

* [A statement strangely erroneous in both its members. The Apostle expresses no horror whatever of death. His groans are forced from him, not so much even by the pressure of present suffering, as by the earnestness of his longing for the heavenly state. And still more objectionable is the reference to Gethsemane, in so far as it overlooks the supernatural elements in our Lord's passion.—J. L.]

and sober import. From the most intimate converse with the Lord he gives forth his explanations respecting the course of the kingdom of God, the crises of Divine providence, and its final issues: Eph. iii. 3, 5 sqq.; Rom. xi. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 51 sqq.; and here. It is a weighty problem, and, God be praised! it is also a privilege vouchsafed in ever larger measure to our times, to bring one's self into living communion with the prophetic word. Our very reverence for it should, indeed, restrain us from precipitate conclusions.

5. (Vv. 15–17.) Our passage furnishes no complete doctrine of the last things. In Scripture generally there remains over for curiosity a multitude of unanswered questions; and even the legitimate desire of knowledge must acquiesce. Whatever is necessary to salvation, and serves to further the process of sanctification, is nowhere wanting. In this spirit should the doctrine of the Christian hope be dealt with (Luthardt, *die Lehre von den letzten Dingen*, Leipzig, 1861). Our passage says nothing beforehand of the condition that immediately follows death; nothing beyond calling it a sleep. A preliminary judgment, an introductory stage of blessedness, is indicated by the passages cited in Exeg. Note 1. A being with Christ is there promised to such as die in Christ; yet must it be inferior in fulness and power to the life of the resurrection (comp. Rev. vi. 9–11), without our being able to define precisely the difference. Paul takes the less notice here of this topic, from his having to correct the anxiety of the Thessalonians in regard to the disadvantage which the dead might be under at the Advent. What is of use to this end he holds up to their view. Nor does he in our passage go further. But it easily admits of being combined with other passages into a general representation. Now what Paul says of the Coming was understood by the Reformers altogether of His Coming at the Last Judgment; as by Calvin, in express opposition to the Chiliasts, though under the supposition, to be sure, that they teach the wild doctrine of a resurrection for only a thousand years. But even in the Apocalypse there is no mention of any such thing. If we take into view the passage in the Revelation, xx. 1–6, the question is, whether and in what way it may be reconciled with the doctrine of the Apostle Paul. An obvious expedient apparently is to identify the Advent here, v. 15, and 1 Cor. xv. 23, with the return at the setting up of the (millennial) kingdom, and in like manner the first resurrection of the Apocalypse with the resurrection of the just (Luke xiv. 14) or the gathering together of the elect (Matt. xxiv. 31), but positively to distinguish this from the final judgment on the whole world (Matt. xxv. 31; Rev. xx. 11 sqq.);* this last judgment, including the general resurrection, would then be comprehended in the end of which Paul, after making mention of the resurrection τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, says: εἶτα τὸ τέλος (1 Cor. xv. 24). More closely examined, however, the passages do not quite so readily admit of mutual adjustment. In the first place, at the text last mentioned no one without the Apocalypse would think, that this εἶτα embraces a thousand years.† And for this reason, accordingly, the Reformers, disregarding the Apocalypse, conceived of the raising of the dead as occurring at one and the same time, and supposed that such passages as John v. 28, 29; Acts xxiv. 15; 2 Cor. v. 10 speak of a simultaneous resurrection of the just and the unjust, and that Matt. xxiv. likewise refers to no other coming of Christ than Matt. xxv. In like manner, and this is the second point, Matt. xxv. shows us the saved *alongside of* the lost, and says nothing of a first resurrection which had already, a thousand years before, brought the elect to glory. In our passage, indeed, and just so in 1 Cor. xv., Paul is entirely silent about those who are lost. Calvin: The object here is, not to alarm the ungodly, but to heal the immoderate grief of the pious. The resurrection to judgment, therefore, might be thought of as contemporaneous with that of the pious, or on the other hand as following at a later date. Only it is to be noticed that 1 Cor. xv. represents the raising of those who belong to Christ as something done once for all; then follows the end, when He shall deliver up the kingdom to the Father, after He has abolished all hostile rule. This does not sound as if still another host of those belonging to Christ would not share in the salvation till a later and final judgment, as must yet be the case, if Matt. xxv. speaks of this final judgment. On the whole, as it is important to fulfil the condition on which alone we can be sure of salvation, so it is difficult, if not impossible, to set up unexceptionable tests, according to which some are made partakers of the first resurrection, others only of the second, who are nevertheless saved. After all, the relation might rather be this, that the Pauline statements, as well as the passages which speak briefly of the last day, the last hour (John vi. 39, 40; 1 John ii. 18; comp. 2 Pet. iii. 10, 12), comprehend the coming of the Lord in one view, which the Apocalypse then distributes into various stages. But as the day of the Lord divides itself in the later revelation into a series of steps, so also the resurrection of those belonging to Christ, since the first resurrection by no means merely passes by the raising of the lost to judgment, but shows likewise a later resurrection to life as still possible. To the end belongs the glorification also of the terrestrial world (Rom. viii.; Rev. xxi. xxii.); and after that the saved have reigned together with Christ in the kingdom (2 Tim. ii. 12), and have co-operated with Him in the judgment (1 Cor. vi. 2, 3). That is to say, from their heavenly thrones (Rev. xx. 4) the kingdom will pass into its stage of highest fulfilment, when God shall be all in all (1 Cor. xv. 28). In many places, however, these stages are viewed together indiscriminately. Such a comprehension of details, which are only kept apart by later prediction, meets us also elsewhere in all prophecy.

6. The last remark affords us light also in regard to the hope of the nearness of the Advent (see Exeg. Note 7). From the patriarchs down through the entire line of the prophets every one contemplates the future salvation as one whole, with all its details, without any one being able to say: There is here a want of perspective, an optical illusion. Rather, the living fulness of the future is conjoined with the varying standpoint of the present in one bud. The certainty, that the Lord is coming with His salvation, is so stirring, bright, overpowering, that the man who is full of it says: *Quickly!* The Assyrian period is Isaiah's horizon, into which he

* [It should not be hastily assumed that Matt. xxv. 31–46 refers, at least exclusively, to the same process of judgment as Rev. xx. 11 sqq. See Bickersteth's *Practical Guide to the Prophecies*, ch. xvii.; Brooks' *Essays on the Advent and Kingdom of Christ*, Part ii. Essay iv.; Wood's *Last Things*, ch. iii. Prop. viii.—J. L.]

† [And yet there can be no doubt that the ἔπειτα of v. 23 embraces the longer interval between Christ's resurrection and that of his followers.—J. L.]

sees Immanuel enter, bringing salvation (Is. vii. xxix. 17). And again there was a delay of four hundred years, before the promise in Malachi (ch. iii.) began to be fulfilled. Prophecy is not the knowledge of the history of the future, but a contemplation of the essential steps of development. Instructive is such a passage as Ezek. xii. 22 sqq.; especially even because it is there shown to us, how long-suffering delayed the judgment, and how contempt of the long-suffering accelerates it. Thus there came to pass finally what for so long a time the prophets had promised and threatened, and the scoffers had scoffed at; it came, according to human reckoning, later than had been supposed, yet not too late for any one, rather too soon for many. And as the New Testament time came, so will come the final term promised by Christ and the Apostles. Yea, they declared with truth that it had already arrived. With Christ began the world's last hour, and there comes none later, to establish another and higher relation between God and humanity. If the period of waiting for the revelation of the Lord has reached much further than the Apostles supposed, and even than the words of Christ gave them reason to expect (Matt. x. 23; xvi. 28; xxiv. 29), it is to be considered, first, that in this very way scope was afforded for the development of the series of stages in His coming; and, secondly, that it behoves us to recognize long-suffering in the fact that, after the first step of the judgment (on Jerusalem), the second was deferred (2 Pet. iii. 8, 9, 15). But, while acknowledging His sparing long-suffering, we acknowledge also that His government is so arranged as to admit of modification according to the faithfulness or unfaithfulness of men; that we are wrong, therefore, in taking, much more than we are aware of, necessitarian views of prophecy. So much the more short-sighted were it to say, that a disappointment respecting the date is proof that such last things are not to be expected at all. A denial of the world's end would require us also to assert that humanity has never had a beginning; and this would imply that the life of humanity has no aim, and that the establishment of a perfect, holy reign of God is not to be looked for. But he alone is a Christian, who directs his life toward this mark. Of the time and the hour he knows nothing. "The Lord delayeth His coming!"—that he leaves the wicked servant to say; that the Bridegroom may tarry, he is well aware. There are also things that must still precede; not the conversion of the nations, but the preaching of the gospel among all nations (Matt. xxiv. 14); along with this, the universal security of those who believe in no Advent, and by means of their unbelief are witnesses for the truth (1 Thess. v. 3; Matt. xxiv. 37 sqq.; Luke xviii. 8); the apostasy of Christendom from the faith (2 Thess. ii.). All these signs are perceptibly growing. The life of humanity, including the individual life, goes forward on the brink of eternity and to eternity. It is readily conceivable that the experience of a longer duration of the world, according to man's measurement, has modified in some degree our views of the last things, and turned the eye chiefly toward the death of individuals. But only too frequently does this way of thinking assume such a form, that the longing for the coming of the Lord and the glory of His holy kingdom, as well as sympathy in the fortunes of the Church at large, is too much impaired. At times, on the other hand, and amongst the pious, when the life of faith rules in due force, we again meet likewise with the apostolic hope and aspiration in living freshness. That watching and hoping are so unfamiliar to us, is a defect. The more we become heavenly in our character and thoughts, the more also does the stream of human history appear to us as a hasting towards the coming of the Lord.

7. (V. 17.) The being caught away to meet the Lord is in the Irvingite * interpretation erroneously explained in a manner that seems to bear the dignity of an inviolable dogma. Comp. the work, which otherwise contains many good practical exhortations, by E. L. Geering, *Mahnung und Trost der Schrift in Betreff der Wiederkunft Christi*, Basel, 1859. It is there taught (p. 55) that, *previous to* the coming tribulation, the company of disciples, who are witnessing for Jesus and waiting for Him, is brought into a condition of safety. Indeed, the saints will with Him judge the world (1 Cor. vi. 2); their deliverance, therefore, through being taken away, *precedes* the Lord's return; and on p. 60 mention is made of servants of Christ who are not, it is true, recklessly profane nor yet hypocrites, but still are not looking out for the coming of the Lord, nor striving towards it, and, as their punishment for this, have no part in the rapture of the faithful servants, but must undergo the rule of Antichrist's reign. They have forfeited their title to be kept from the hour of temptation, of the great tribulation, which comes on all (Rev. iii. 10). They might have been preserved and taken away from it.—This whole interpretation has at least no sort of foundation in our text. The German word *entrücken* (to snatch from) might give the impression that it refers to the taking away from a threatening danger. But Paul speaks of a swift-coming to meet the Lord, without regard to the question whether this is before or after the endurance of tribulation. To the view of Christendom in general he holds up, as prior to the coming of the Lord, the coming of the apostasy, and the tyranny of the Man of Sin (2 Thess. ii.). The keeping which the disciples need is not necessarily a being kept from the experience of this persecution, as if to be kept in the midst of it, to be kept while in the world from the evil—the thing which the Lord seeks in prayer for His disciples (John xvii. 15)—were a penal condition. There are various ways in which the keeping may rather take place: 1. by a previous death (Is. lvii. 1, 2; Rev. xiv. 13); 2. by endurance of martyrdom without renouncing the faith (Matt x. 28 sqq.; 2 Thess. ii.; Rev. xi. 7; xiii. 15; xx. 4); perhaps also, 3. by remaining hidden, in the case especially of the humble class, like the seven thousand in the time of Elias (Rom. xi. 4). There may be a participation in the judgment by those caught away to the Lord (as *assessores judicii*, Bengel), without the interpretation which we oppose. Altogether it is possible to love the coming of the Lord Jesus, without adopting the peculiar Irvingite exegesis. To represent the two things as inseparable, and to determine accordingly the reward of being caught away or the penalty of being left—this is, 1. in itself a wrong, as in every case where a human dogma is set up, and salvation connected with the acceptance of it; 2. it misleads to a groundless confidence, and is a sort of illusory promise, that is not free from an effeminate fear of suffering. Comp. Luthardt, l. c. p. 37 sqq.

* [The reference is to that in many respects remarkable body of Christians, which chooses to call itself the *Catholic Apostolic Church*. The other name of *Irvingites* they expressly disclaim as a misrepresentation at once of the origin and the spirit of the movement.—J. L.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

V. 13. It is a heathenish ignorance of which a Christian must be ashamed, when he knows nothing of hope for the dead.—He who does not believe is ignorant; faith is not opposed to knowledge.—ZWINGLI: When we fear death, it is a sure sign that we have no love to God.—In so far as there is still selfishness in our love, and for that reason discomposure at the death of our friends, to the same extent are we not yet duly taught of God.

Death a sleep, but only through Christ; and only for faith, which knows the Awakener.—ROOS: Death has an entrance, and also an outlet. We must and we desire to go the way that Christ went.

Scripture does not forbid us to mourn, but only to mourn as those without hope.—RIEGER: By the examples of others, that nearly concern us, the thoughts of our hearts are revealed to us—our own dying agony.—LUTHER: Holy Scripture not merely indulges, but commends and praises those who are sorrowful, and lament for the dead (Abraham, Joseph, the people at the death of Aaron and Moses). The Apostle simply distinguishes between the mourning of the heathen and that of Christians.—THE SAME: It is an artificial virtue and fictitious fortitude of heathens and schismatics, when they pretend that we must entirely extract what is creaturely in us, and hold no terms with nature. Such a hard heart has never truly loved, and would fain dissemble before people. He is a Christian, who, while experiencing sorrow, yet so restrains himself therein that the spirit rules over the flesh.—We are allowed to weep for death. It is one thing, when Christ, who wept Himself, dries our tears, and another thing, when men would forbid them to flow. But we have no occasion to weep for the lot of those who have fallen asleep in the Lord. Whoever laments without measure or restraint, acts as a heathen acts.—BENGEL: The effect of the Christian faith is neither to abolish nor yet to aggravate grief for the dead, but gently to moderate it.—DIEDRICH: We need not be in a state of fearful uncertainty about any Christian, whether living or dead.—HEUBNER: Christianity teaches men to rise superior to natural sorrow, yea, to rejoice therein.—The ancient Christians called the day of the believer's death his birthday.

[Ignorance of the truth and purposes of God, so far as these have been revealed, injurious to our spiritual comfort and edification. "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren"—a common scriptural formula.—DODDRIDGE: Let us charge it upon our hearts, that we do honor to our holy profession in every circumstance, and particularly in our *sorrows* as well as our *joys*.—M. HENRY: *All* grief for the death of friends is far from being unlawful; we may weep at least for *ourselves*, if we do not weep for *them;* weep for our own loss, though that may be their gain. Yet we must not be immoderate or excessive in our sorrows.—J. L.]

V. 14. LUTHER: Our death Paul calls not a death, but a sleep; Christ's death he calls a real death, which has swallowed up all other deaths. [So BURKITT: Jesus *died*, the saints *sleep*. . . . I do not find that Christ's death is called a sleep; no, His death was death indeed, death with a curse in it.—J. L.] —LUTHER: If Christ is risen, that must surely not be in vain and without fruit.—[The text of Archbishop TILLOTSON's Sermon on "The certainty and the blessedness of the resurrection of true Christians."—J. L.]

Vv. 13, 14. RIEGER: The two main sources of all comfort, and of all resignation in dying, lie in the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus (Rev. i. 18). Whatever is trying and severe in death comes either from attachment to the visible from which we are separated, or from the uncertainty in which we stand in regard to the invisible. The former trouble is relieved by the death of Jesus, the second by his life.—STÄHELIN: If thou thyself wouldest not, or if thy friends are not to sorrow, see that thou fall asleep through the Lord Jesus.—Hast thou hope? 1. On what is it founded? on the belief that Jesus died and rose again; 2. To what does it impel thee? to a life in Christ, that we through Christ may fall asleep; 3. Of what does it assure thee? that God will bring us with Jesus.—[Bishop WILSON has a Funeral Sermon on these verses.—J. L.]

V. 15. LUTHER: God has spoken the word, not Paul out of his own head.—It is with the Apostle a great certainty: The Lord speaks through me. It is a folly that we find it so much harder to trust to the word of the Lord with our whole heart than to that of men, who are yet but dust, and liars to boot. As disciples of these men of God, we should endeavor, in what we say of Divine things, to say it as the word of God in the assurance of faith (2 Cor. iv. 13).—LUTHER: The voice or word of all teachers, who preach the gospel pure and simple, is not their word or voice, but God's (Luke x. 16).—STARKE: Man's words have little power, but God's word penetrates the heart, is strong to comfort, and endures in sorrow and death (Rom. xv. 4).

The experience, that the coming of the Lord has been delayed longer than the Apostles hoped and desired, is indeed a severe discipline for us while waiting. It is nevertheless a weakness, when watching and longing are relaxed, and drowsiness seizes even the wise virgins.—RIEGER: In the unbelieving world the feeling of security is diffused from one generation to another, and comes to its height amongst the last scoffers; and so, on the other hand, in the communion of saints readiness for the coming of Jesus spreads from one generation to another.*—*Berlenburger Bibel:* The word is prophetic, and goes through all times.—VIETOR (*zwei Osterpredigten*, Bremen, 1859, p. 24): In the world there is derision and laughter, when a man would say, that he knows not whether the Lord will not come during his lifetime. The world can conceive of nothing wilder or crazier. Passing on in unbelief, the world says: "The Lord comes not at all." Passing on with a show of faith and a half-faith, the world says: "My Lord comes not yet for a long time." Oh, see to it, that thy heart consent not to either speech.

V. 16. The Lord comes to take us to Himself; only thus can we come to Him.—LUTHER: What the trumpet is, I know not; we would not gloss Paul's words, but let them stand just as they are. In another place: These are merely *verba allegorica.* He would fain represent the matter, as one must represent it to children and simple people.†

[J. LILLIE: No phantom, nor providential sub-

* [The parallel would be more complete, if, as has sometimes been inferred from Mal. iv. 5, 6 and Rev. xix. 7, 8, as well as from the analogous work of John the Baptist before the first appearing of the Lord, the last generation of the Church is to witness a special work of preparation for the marriage-supper of the Lamb.—J. L.]

† [This, it must be confessed, is nothing more than a somewhat venturesome gloss. I prefer the caution of the previous remark. See my *Lectures on the Thessalonians*, pp. 264-265.—J. L.]

stitute, nor even the vicarious Spirit; but *the Lord Himself*—the personal Lord—this same Jesus.—VAUGHAN: Not a mere amelioration, gradual or sudden, of the condition of the Church or the world; not a mere displacement of evil and triumph of good; not a mere crisis of human affairs, issuing in times of universal blessing and happiness: it shall be a personal coming. Matt. xxiv. 30; Acts i. 11.—J. L.]

They who are asleep in the Lord are still, even as dead persons, always in Christ (Luke xx. 38).—STARKE: Whoever is found to the last in the holy life of Jesus, falls asleep through Jesus.—Comp. Ps. xxvi. 15, and Luther's comment, *Werke*, ed. Walch, xii. 2652 sqq.

V. 17. STARKE: If we would one day be caught up to Christ, we must even now follow His gracious guidance, and lift up our heart to Him. If we would be, with body and soul, ever with the Lord, we must with our spirit be with Him even now (Col. iii. 1, 2).—THE SAME: All believers shall one day be near and with Christ, because, 1. such is His promise to them (John xiv. 3); 2. He has asked this for Himself from the Father (John xvii. 24; Is. liii. 10-12); 3. He, the Head, and they, His members, are inseparable (Eph. i. 22, 23; Rom. viii. 38, 39).—RIEGER: To be forever with the Lord is a brief but comprehensive description of eternal life. When kept as seed-corn in the heart, not stowed away as knowledge in the head; when fruitful in love to Jesus and in patience under suffering, not directed to glorying over others, these truths will evidence their consolatory power, and may also be suitably applied in mutual exhortation. Oh, the preciousness of communion with Jesus, and of that boast of faith: Whether we live or die, we are the Lord's!

[M. HENRY: It will be some part of their felicity, that all the saints shall *meet* together, and *remain together* forever: but the principal happiness of heaven is this, *to be with the Lord*, to *see* Him, *live* with Him, and *enjoy* Him forever.—Dr. DONNE has a sermon on this verse.—J. L.]

V. 18.—ZWINGLI: This is a quite different consolation from: Provide for so many soul-masses; Call in so many priests.—But (*Berlenburger Bibel*): It is also a false consolation to suppose it to be a settled matter, that every one through death enters heaven.—It is not death that saves us, but Christ through death, and at last from death. They who have died through Him unto sin, and have spiritually risen with Him, may be sure that they shall also live with Him in the body. So likewise the talk about meeting again, when we do not rely on Christ, and are not united in Christ with them that are His, is a very weak and delusive consolation. We should indeed maintain a union in heart with our dead, but in Christ the Lord; as those introduced into connection with the unimpaired Bible order of salvation and the kingdom, in which hope rests on a living faith in Christ, and holds out to every individual member the prospect of the higher stage of blessedness only in union with the entire body.—Comfort one another with these words; with that, which will cause the kindreds of the earth to wail.—HEUBNER: The gospel is the true book of consolation. Entering this sanctuary, we enter a quite different world. We learn that our own personal concerns are far from equalling in interest the holy concerns of the kingdom of God. We enter a circle of people, who, leaving all personal interests aside, only serve the Lord.—The consolation of the gospel consists in teaching us to save our life by giving it up for the Lord's sake. In Him we find again also our loved ones, who are become members of Christ. (Concerning those who had no opportunity of learning the knowledge of Christ, comp. *Apologetische Beiträge* by GESS and RIGGENBACH, Basel, 1863, p. 168 sqq.; p. 234 sqq.)—STARKE: Since in this vale of tears no one is wholly free from affliction, and we have frequent need of comfort and encouragement, every believer, even if not a teacher, should regard it as his Christian obligation to comfort others. One Christian ought to be the priest and comforter of another.—It is not said merely: You teachers or preachers, comfort the common people.

On the whole section: 1 Thess. iv. 13-18 is the Epistle for the 25th Sunday after Trinity. HEUBNER: The Christian revelation on the future life: 1. It gives us, *a.* a consolatory hope, which lifts us far above the hopelessness of such as are not Christians, because, *b.* it rests on the sure foundation of Christ's death and resurrection, and therefore, *c.* embraces those who through all time belong to Christ. 2. It gives us, moreover, special disclosures, *a.* respecting the visible Advent, and revelation of the glory of Christ; *b.* respecting the manner of our participation therein, and thus opens to us, *c.* the richest source of consolation.

THE SAME: The ground of the Christian's comfort in the death of those he loves. Jesus the bond between the living and the dead.—Looking by faith toward the coming of the Lord helps us to look on our brethren with hallowed love.

The passages from LUTHER are taken from his sermons on this section, delivered by him on occasion of the death of the Electors Frederick and John, 1525 and 1532; see *Werke*, ed. Walch, xii. p. 2578 sqq.

CH. V. 1-11.

2. But when He will come, we know not; let your walk, therefore, be at all times watchful and sober.

1 But of [concerning, περί] the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no
2 need that I write [it be written][1] unto you: for yourselves know perfectly that
3 the[2] day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. For when [When][3]
they shall say [are saying][4]: Peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh
upon[5] them, as [even as, ὥσπερ] travail upon a woman [her that is, τῇ] with
4 child, and they shall not [in no wise][6] escape. But ye, brethren, are not in

5 darkness, that that [the, ἡ] day should overtake you as a thief.[6] [For][7] ye
are all the children of light, and the children of the day [all ye are sons of light,
and sons of day]:[8] we are not of the night [of night, νυκτός], nor of darkness.
6 Therefore [So then][9] let us not sleep, as *do* others [as *do* also the rest];[10] but
7 let us watch and be sober. For they that sleep sleep in the night [by night,
νυκτός]; and they that be [are] drunken are drunken in the night [by night,
8 νυκτός]. But let us, who are of the day [being of day],[11] be sober, putting on
[having put on][12] the breastplate of faith and love, and, for an helmet, the hope
9 of salvation. For [Because, ὅτι] God hath not appointed [did not appoint, οὐκ
ἔθετο] us to wrath, but to obtain [to the obtaining of, εἰς περιποίησιν] salvation by
10 [through, διά] our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for[13] us, that, whether we
wake or sleep [are watching or sleeping],[14] we should live together with Him.
11 Wherefore comfort yourselves together [comfort one another, παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλή-
λους], and edify one another [one the other, εἰς τὸν ἕνα], even as also ye do.

[1] V. 1.—[ὑμῖν γράφεσθαι. Ellicott, Webster and Wilkinson: *ye have no need to be written unto.* Vaughan better: *that* anything *be written to you.* The impersonal form of the Greek is preserved by most of the Latin, and by several German, versions. Comp. ch. iv. 9, Critical Note 1.—Sin.[1]: τοῦ γράφεσθαι ὑμῖν; but a correction omits τοῦ.—J. L.]

[2] V. 2.—[Sin. and] most of the old authorities omit [and so Lachmann, Tischendorf, Wordsworth, Ellicott. Alford brackets] the article ἡ, without change of the sense; comp. Winer, § 19, 1, 2; Phil. i. 6, 10; ii. 16. (Hofmann correct y against Lünemann.)

[3] V. 3.—The ὅταν γάρ of the *Recepta* has in its favor only a few of the older authorities; B. D. E. S n.[2] give ὅταν δέ; but the preference is due to ὅταν, A. F. G., Vv., also Sin.[1], as the simplest reading, which afterwards received various glosses. [ὅταν is the reading of Griesbach and the critical editors generally, except that Lachmann adds δέ in brackets. —J. L.]

[4] V. 3.—[λέγωσιν. Comp. E. V., Matt. vi. 2, 5, 6, 16; x. 19, 23; &c.—ἐφίσταται; Sin.: ἐπίσταται.—J. L.]

[5] V. 3.—[οὐ μὴ. Comp. ch. iv. 15, Critical Note 8.—J. L.]

[6] V. 4.—Lachmann has only A. B. and the Coptic for his reading, κλέπτας, which gives no good sense, and has a too one-sided (Alex.) support.

[7] V. 5.—[Sin. and] almost all the uncials [and critical editors] give γάρ.

[8] V. 5.—[πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς υἱοὶ φωτός ἐστε καὶ υἱοὶ ἡμέρας. The ὑμεῖς is emphatic. For *sons*, see E. V., 2 Thess. ii. 3, and generally.—J. L.]

[9] V. 6.—[ἄρα οὖν. *Revision:* "Paul's favorite, though unclassical, ἄρα οὖν—(no one else uses it; and he, I think, 12 times)—serves for the vivid introduction of an immediate (ἄρα. See Hartung, p. 422, &c., and Passow, *s. v.*) inference (οὖν) from what he has been saying; very much as our *Why then!* is sometimes employed."—J. L.]

[10] V. 6.—*καί* [cancelled by Lachmann, and bracketed by Riggenbach] is wanting in A. B. Sin.[1]; most of the authorities have it. [Comp. ch. iv. 13, Critical Note 4.]

[11] V. 8.—[ἡμέρας ὄντες. *Revision:* "Ὄντες, without the article, is not used to specify a class; it rather assumes, as the ground of the exhortation, what had just been asserted, v. 5."—*The same:* "Throughout this context the distinction is maintained between ἡμέρα, *day*, that element of light, and of free, joyous activity, to which Christians now belong, and ἡ ἡμέρα, [ἡ] ἡμέρα Κυρίου, *the* perfect *day, the day of the Lord*, for which they are still waiting."—J. L.]

[12] V. 8.—[ἐνδυσάμενοι;—Christian sobriety being the result of this gracious endowment. Vaughan: "A single act, never to be undone."—The words καὶ ἀγάπης are wanting in Sin.[1], but supplied by correction.—In v. 9, for ἀλλ' εἰς, the latest editors generally give ἀλλὰ εἰς, with Sin. B. D.[3] E. &c.—J. L.]

[13] V. 10.—Instead of ὑπέρ (*for, in favor of*) B. and Sin. give περί (*on account of, with reference to*). [Sin.[2]: ὑπέρ.—J. L.]

[14] V. 10.—[εἴτε γρηγορῶμεν, εἴτε καθεύδωμεν—at the Lord's coming. The former verb occurs 23 times in the New Testament, and, excepting in this instance, the idea of watchfulness, vigilance, is always expressed in our English version. Here, where the word is used of the believers who shall be *living* when the Lord returns, it is assumed that they will also be *watching* for that event.—J. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. (Vv. 1, 2.) **But concerning the times and the seasons,** &c.—Here Paul treats of the Advent from the other side, and exhorts us to be at all times composed and ready for the day of the Lord—equally remote from anxious calculation or impatient expectancy: *Now He comes!* and from the drowsy security which says: *Not for a long time yet!* How much of erroneous opinion, if any, existed in Thessalonica (but see v. 2); whether they had caused a question to be put to him, and so forth—on these points we know nothing very precisely. The Second Epistle gives evidence of greater excitement in the church, not as if the First Epistle were responsible for that, but at most the misunderstanding of it, and, in particular, the want of attention to our present section. As here, the two expressions χρόνοι and καιροί stand together at Acts i. 7, and there too the Lord says: οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστὶν γνῶναι. In like manner Acts iii. 19, 21 puts the καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως by the side of the χρόνοι ἀποκαταστάσεως, &c. (Whereas Matt. xxiv. 36 and Mark xiii. 32 connect ἡμέρα and ὥρα.) According to the old lexicographers and general usage (see WETSTEIN), the difference is that χρόνοι denotes duration, spaces of time, periods; καιροί, points of time, crises, the times appropriate to a decision, the epochs of a catastrophe. The plural is especially worthy of notice, as pointing to the possibility of a repeated alternation of periods of development and crises of decision, and so to a possibly longer duration. On this subject **ye have no need that it be written unto you** (see on ch. iv. 9); at ch. iv. 13 the Apostle found it necessary to remedy an ἀγνοεῖν; here is a recurrence merely of the need of confirmation, as at ch. iv. 9. They have no need, not because there is no instruction to be given, not because they are already watchful (BENGEL), but because, of what was sufficient for them to know, they themselves had already an exact, positive certainty; to wit, not of the *when*, that being altogether uncertain, but of something quite different, namely, the quality of the Coming, the suddenness of its arrival—the οὕτως, instead of the πότε. The ἀκριβῶς would lead us rather to expect a fixing of the time; there is something surprising in this turn: *ye know precisely*—that the time cannot be known! Indeed, that lies in the nature of the

ease; the day *is to be* a surprise to the whole world. There is no determination of the time—only of the signs of the time. This is implied in the distinction: **as a thief in the night;** at a time, therefore, when the secure are asleep, resting without care. If, instead of wishing to calculate dates, regard is had (and inquiry directed, 1 Pet. i. 11) to the consideration of the signs (Matt. xvi. 3), this is not forbidden, but required, by the uncertainty of the crisis. The day of the Lord is a synonym of the Advent, ch. iv. 15; but the former expression makes more prominent the idea of the judgment-day, and stands opposed to the time preceding, as of prevailing night. Then too it may be of longer duration than a day of earth, so that one can perceive that the Advent brings the dawn of that day. Already the prophets speak of the day of Jehovah, in which He manifests Himself in His Divine glory; Joel i. 15; ii. 11; iii. 19 [of the Hebrew arrangement; in the English Bible, 14]; Is. ii. 12; Zeph. i. 15 (Vulg.: *Dies iræ, dies illa*); Ezek. xiii. 5; Mal. iii. 2, 19, 23 [English Bible: iv. 1, 5]. The reference is, indeed, partly to particular, preliminary judgments; but more and more to the conclusive final judgment. In the New Testament Christ is the Lord, who will appear in the day of the Lord, 1 Cor. i. 8, and often. This day comes—oxymoron: *as a thief in the night;* so it is said of the day in 2 Pet. iii. 10; of the Lord Himself, Matt. xxiv. 43 and the parallel passages; Rev. iii. 3; xvi. 15; *ὡς κλέπτης* is quite strongly resumed by *οὕτως*:* *in such a manner it comes;* HOFMANN: *such is the manner of its coming* (not, as BENGEL would have it: *so as the following verse declares*). It *comes;* the suddenness is not implied in the present (BENGEL); that might mean: *surely and in the near future;* it is better taken as a doctrinal present: *such is the manner of it*, without regard to the time, as 1 Cor. xv. 35. [ALFORD: "It is its attribute, to come." ELLICOTT: "Its fixed nature and prophetic certainty."—J. L.] The figure of the thief seems to be an ignoble one; but the Lord is not so nice. The comparison is striking, and describes the coming not merely as something sudden and unexpected, but also as unwelcome, terrifying for the worldly-minded, plundering them of that to which their heart clings, stripping them of their possessions (HOFMANN). In the ancient Church there was connected with this comparison the notion, that the Advent would take place in the night, and still more precisely on Easter-night, like the Passover in Egypt; hence the Vigils (LACTANTIUS and JEROME, in LÜNEMANN). It deserves to be noted, how closely the Apostle in his preaching at Thessalonica must have conformed to the eschatological discourses of Christ in Matt. xxiv. and the parallel passages; though there is no evidence for EWALD's opinion, that Paul had given the church a written document.

2. (V. 3.) **When they are saying: Peace and safety,** &c.—*Ὅταν γάρ* would explain the *κλέπτης*; *ὅταν δέ* would be a transition from *κλέπτης* to the description of a false peace: *But this will happen precisely then.* It is best to regard the description as going forward by asyndeton, and as in its very form representing the swiftness of the occurrence. *When they are saying*—these for whom it comes as a thief, the ungodly-minded, the people who have no everlasting hope (ch. iv.); Christians are people of no such drowsy slumberings (v. 4). The human heart longs for peace; but, where it is unreconciled to God, there it lulls itself in treacherous hopes and semblances of peace, Jer. vi. 14; Ezek. xiii. 10. *Peace, and a safety* without danger,* scil. *ἐστίν*. In the passages just cited from the prophets וָבֶטַח is not added, but in the Sept. Deut. xii. 10, and frequently, this word is well translated by *ἀσφάλεια*. At that very time they are on the point of destruction, which comes on them as a sudden thing (comp. Luke xxi. 34); **as travail** (*ὠδίν* for *ὠδίς*, WINER, § 9. 2. note 1); *οὐ μή*, as in ch. iv. 15. Very suitable is the comparison to a woman with child, and in the prophets it recurs repeatedly, Is. xiii. 8; xxi. 3; xxvi. 17; Jer. vi. 24, and often. The point of comparison is the sudden, inevitable occurrence of the rending pain, the mortal anguish; also perhaps (CALVIN, RIEGER): that they bear within themselves the cause of their sorrow; but not (as DE WETTE would have it) the imminence of the Advent, on the ground that a pregnant woman knows, not indeed the day and hour, but yet the nearness of the period. That is not what Paul would here emphasize, but, on the contrary, worldly men are to be represented as taken altogether at unawares; they might know that it is unavoidable, a little sooner or later; but they do not even think of the matter, it falls on them suddenly; moreover, the signs of warning are for them as if they were not, till of a sudden it becomes manifest that they were pregnant with their own ruin. (The view of the Greek interpreters also does not differ from this.) The figure is applied in another direction, when used to depict the pangs of the new birth with their favorable issue, John xvi. 21; Luke xvii. 33.†

3. (Vv. 4, 5.) **But ye, brethren, are not in darkness,** &c.—*Ye*, in opposition to those who are saying Peace; *brethren*, blessed society! *ἐστέ* with *οὐκ*, not *μή*, is necessarily indicative. He does not enjoin, but asserts. It is a comforting encouragement: Ye are in such a position, and that by a Divine right, that ye do not have to fear the day as a thief; ye are not *in* darkness, held fast, abiding. DE WETTE and others correctly: It is wrong to understand by darkness merely a want of intellectual insight, or simply moral corruption in practice; both sides cohere throughout in the case of light and darkness. Ye are not therein, *ἵνα*—this is not equivalent to *ὥστε* [JOWETT, WEBSTER and WILKINSON], not even in Gal. v. 17; though in the Greek of the New Testament the idea of finality appears to be somewhat weakened (WINER, § 53. 6), it is yet everywhere present in some degree. Here it does not, as LÜNEMANN supposes, indicate the purpose of the Divine punishment,‡ but, as HOFMANN expresses it, that the being in darkness would be required in order to such a surprise;—DE WETTE: in order to

* [The order of the Greek being = *The day of the Lord as a thief in the night so cometh.*—J. L.]

* [ELLICOTT: "*Εἰρήνη* betokens an inward repose and security; *ἀσφάλεια*, a sureness and safety that is not interfered with or compromised by outward obstacles."—J. L.]

† [Luke's word, indeed, is *ζωογονήσει*; but in neither of the above texts is there, I conceive, any reference, strictly speaking, to the new birth, but rather to the experience of the regenerate—to the blessed result of Christian sorrow and self-sacrifice.—J. L.]

‡ [ALFORD: "The *purpose* in the Divine arrangement: for with God all results are purposed." ELLICOTT: "The *purpose* contemplated by God in His merciful dispensation implied in *οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σκότει*. . . . It may be doubted, however, whether we have not here some trace of a secondary force of *ἵνα* (see on Eph. i. 17), the eventual conclusion being in some degree mixed up with and observing the idea of finality; comp. notes on Gal. v. 17."—J. L.]

have you overtaken;—it would be the unintentional purpose of being in darkness; comp. εἰς τό, ch. ii. 16. Therefore, even if the day does come suddenly, still it brings to you no terror or loss (there is somewhat of greater emphasis in ὑμᾶς, over against the secure ones of v. 3, when, as in a series of uncials, it appears prefixed;* yet the Vatican and Sinai manuscripts are for the common position after ἡμέρα). Only on such as are in darkness does the day come as a thief; it is no longer said: *the day of the Lord;* nor yet: *as a thief in the night;* because now the day (the day of the Lord, it is true) is put simply as the time of light breaking in on the darkness (HOFMANN). The various reading ὡς κλέπτας (not confirmed by the *Sinait.*) goes farther. GROTIUS, LACHMANN, DE WETTE, EWALD, favor it as the more difficult reading, the sense being (DE WETTE), that the time of light, triumphant truth and righteousness, overtakes thieves, who ply their trade in the night; EWALD: On you the day need not come, as on those who creep in the dark, as if ye yourselves were night-loving thieves, robbing God of His gifts and His glory. The variation, however, is too generally neglected by the other manuscripts, versions, and Fathers, and the change of the thought, likewise, is too abrupt, it being only at vv. 5 and 8 that we find the transition from the narrower to the wider conception of ἡμέρα. The reading is, therefore, properly rejected also by LÜNEMANN and HOFMANN.—**For** (nearly all the uncials give γάρ), confirmatory of the previous negative by the opposite positive declaration: **all ye are sons of light.** He thus expresses his cheering confidence to a church converted with such wonderful quickness: Ye are so indeed on the assumed premises; saints, entered into a condition of salvation; though still deficient, and therefore not without need of fresh incitement (v. 6 sqq.). **Sons,** בְּנֵי, is a Hebraism, signifying not merely the fact of belonging to, but descent, a specific nature: who from light have their life, Luke xvi. 8; John xii. 36 (comp. Matt. viii. 12, *sons of the kingdom*, there indeed degenerate). Light is spoken of in another application in the parables of the virgins, and of the servants with their lamps (Matt. xxv.; Luke xii. 35).—**And sons of day;** a strengthening synonym, connected with φῶς also at John xi. 9, 10; over against night and darkness (*chiasmus*). It is not generally asked how these synonyms differ. It will be correct to say that day is the time of prevailing light, night the hour of darkness; thus light and darkness denote the nature of the disposition, day and night the corresponding outward circumstances, the ruling power, and so either the kingdom of light (of spiritual discipline) or the dominion of darkness (of ungodliness). Accordingly, where the inner man is in the light, there also is a wakefulness suitable to the dominion of light in bright day; but where in darkness, there he seeks also the night, a dark environment. Here we have the transition from the day of the Lord (v. 2) to day in general. Moreover, the day of the Lord is essentially light, before which no darkness endures (LÜNEMANN); it puts an end, at last, to the darkness. The continuous state of day (χρόνος) is by the day of the Lord (as καιρός) brought to its crowning consummation. Only the man, who is a son of day generally, can expect with comfort also the day of the Lord, which is helpful to that, in which consists the nature of the sons of day, in obtaining the victory.—**We are not of night,** &c.; we Christians generally; the Apostle includes himself with them (ἐστέ, C.[1] F. G., is a conformation [to the ἐστέ of the first clause]); the genitive now expresses, according to the Greek idiom, belonging to night (the ruling darkness) or to darkness (in our inner nature); comp. WINER, § 30. 5; 1 Cor. vi. 19; Heb. x. 39.

4. (Vv. 6–8.) **So then let us not sleep,** &c.—On his good confidence: *God has wrought His work in you*, he now rests the powerful exhortation: *Let us also, then, not sleep* (EWALD: *fall asleep*). There is cordiality, and encouragement for the readers, in his including himself with them in this. Of the sleep of sin he speaks also in Eph. v. 14; thereby denoting the sluggish, dull, confused nature, unsusceptible of what is Divine, indifferent to salvation; as it is found in *the rest* (ch. iv. 13), those not Christians, the children of darkness.—**But let us watch;** γρηγορεῖν, a later word, formed from ἐγρήγορα, as στήκειν from ἕστηκα. What is meant is clearness of spirit, the freshness of the sharpened sense, vigilant waiting for the Lord, circumspection over against the enemy.—**And be sober,** is frequently joined with watchfulness, 1 Pet. v. 8, and often. As intoxication in the literal sense disposes to sleep, so is it here understood in a comprehensive signification. The innate weakness and sluggishness of the flesh of itself inclines to drowsiness (Matt. xxvi. 41); therefore should we avoid what would involve us in the guilt of self-stupefaction, and of thus aggravating this tendency. Already CHRYSOSTOM remarks on the other side: Sobriety is the augmentation of watchfulness.—**For**—extends over vv. 7, 8, and confirms the summons of v. 6: truly it becomes us not, to do as the children of night. In the night they sleep and are drunken; the latter referring to the custom of nocturnal symposia. It is too far-fetched, when KOCH and HOFMANN would from the first understand the night only figuratively: *With those who sleep, and get drunk, it is night;* no; when it is night, they do so; BENGEL: *a die abhorrent.* But, of course, what is said in the first instance literally is meant as a simile: Where night surrounds them, there they haunt, and indulge their dull, sluggish tendency; nay more, they make the case still worse, by practices which subject them more and more to the power of darkness.—**But let us,** as belonging to the day, where light rules, walking in day toward the great day, **be sober;** here, on the tide of the positive exhortation, this only is repeated, which it is incumbent on us to do, lest we deprive ourselves of watchfulness.—**Having put on;** they who watch are also clothed; they who are called to the conflict are equipped with armor. The inward, courageous preparation is the main thing; but that impels to the use of the right means. As those who have put on, &c., we should shun intoxication, which disables the combatant. The Christian, called to the fight of faith (1 Tim. vi. 12), must be ready for assaults, and watch as a soldier at his post. To put on the new man (Eph. iv. 24)—the vesture which comes from above, and, remaining not on the outside, swallows up the old nature (1 Cor. xv. 54)—is the same thing as to put on Christ (Rom. xiii. 14). That is his adornment, the covering of his nakedness, the robe of righteousness (Is. lxi. 3, 10). But, with reference to the conflict, it is his armor (Is. lix. 17; Rom. xiii. 12; 2 Cor. x. 4; and especially, for details, Eph. vi. 13 sqq.). In the last passage mention

* [ὑμᾶς ἡ ἡμέρα. So A. D. E. F. G. Vulg., &c. LACHMANN, ELLICOTT.—J. L.]

is made of the breastplate of righteousness, and, along with that, of the shield of faith, and the helmet of salvation. In our passage the figure has a somewhat different turn, such figures being developed freely and variously, while the fundamental thought is the same. Here the breastplate is called **the breastplate of faith** (on which, indeed, rests our righteousness) **and love**; the genitives are genitives of apposition: consisting in. **And, for a helmet** (this strictly in apposition), **the hope of** deliverance, **salvation**; genitive of the object, as in ch. i. 3; Rom. v. 2. *Salvation* is to be taken comprehensively, a *complete* redemption from sin and death. The equipment is here carried out only on the defensive side. Sobriety is of no avail, unless we are armed with faith, love, hope. Sobriety keeps us circumspect—shows us what we have to do; but it is only with faith, &c., that we can accomplish it.

5. (Vv. 9, 10.) **Because God did not appoint us to wrath.**—He confirms the ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας: we have such a hope; that was the highest point of what was said before. Let us be stoutly prepared, for indeed God wills our salvation. This being God's will, we may have hope. It is certainly, therefore, a confirmation of v. 8 (against Hofmann, who translates ὅτι by *that*, and finds in it the substance of the hope, as in Rom. viii. 21; but there ἐλπίς has not its substance, as here (σωτηρίας), already defined). **God did not appoint us,** the Hebrew שׂוּם לְ (Judg. i. 28, Sept.), *ordained, appointed to* (John xv. 16; 1 Tim. i. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 8). (Hofmann: *brought into being, in order to perish*—an unimportant distinction.)—**To wrath,** that is, to the endurance of it (ch. i. 10; ii. 16; iv. 6). God wills not our destruction, but our salvation. In His entire purpose there is nothing to harm us, and so neither will there be at the appearing of His day.—**But to the obtaining of salvation**; περιποιεῖν, *to make to remain over;* in the middle: *to save for one's self* (1 Tim. iii. 13); hence the substantive: *gain, acquisition* (2 Thess. ii. 14; Heb. x. 39). In a peculiar sense, 1 Pet. ii. 9: *people of the Divine possession* [comp. Eph. i. 14]. Here too Theophylact would understand it thus: *that He should keep us as a possession for Himself.* But this does not suit the addition of σωτηρίας.—**Through Jesus Christ,** might be connected with ἔθετο, but more obviously with περιποίησιν σωτηρίας; Luther: *to possess* [*besitzen*] *salvation through Jesus Christ.* Hence no anxiety in the expectation of the last things.—**Who died for us**; that is the foundation of our περιποί. σωτ. as in ch. iv. 14 of our hope; He died *for* us, *for our benefit* (ὑπέρ), or *on our account* (περί). Neither one nor the other is precisely equivalent to ἀντί, *in our stead.* But there may be cases where the ὑπέρ cannot otherwise be accomplished than by a doing ἀντί, *e. g.* Philem. 13; and it is really ἀντί that stands in the discourse, Matt. xx. 28 (comp. 1 Tim. ii. 6). As the object of Christ's dying, the final aim of the redemptive work, Paul names a powerful consolation in death (thus closing the discussion begun at ch. iv. 13).—**That, whether we are watching or sleeping, we should live together with Him.** That ἵνα, though after a preterite, governs the subjunctive, is explained by Winer, § 41. b. 1. This reacts on εἴτε—εἴτε, so that here also, as with ἐάν τε—ἐάν τε (Rom. xiv. 8), the subjunctive is used (see Winer, p. 263). It is impossible that the watching and sleeping can here be taken in the previous ethical sense, for in the case of sleeping the ἵνα ζήσωμεν would be forfeited. To understand it literally [Whitby, and others] would yield a poor result: *whether at the Advent we are watching in the daytime or lying asleep in the night.* It must therefore be equivalent to the ζῶντες περιλειπόμενοι and κοιμᾶσθαι, ch. iv.; in meaning, the same as Rom. xiv. 8; γρηγορεῖν is in this sense without authority; for καθεύδειν, comp. Matt. ix. 24; Dan. xii. 2, Sept. De Wette finds in this change of senses a violation of the rule of perspicuity. But what the Apostle means has always been evident. Von Gerlach, indeed, remarks, not without reason, that the sleep of death, under which we still suffer, is itself a part of the curse of the sleep of sin. But provided only that we do not καθεύδομεν in the sense of v. 6, let us securely καθεύδειν = κοιμᾶσθαι (ch. iv. 13). There is in this a certain joyous, triumphant pleasantry: Whether at that time we have our eyes still open, or must previously close them, we are (as the result of Christ's death) to live together with Him. By ἅμα Bengel would understand: *Simul, ut fit adventus;* but the necessary supplement would be, not: *together, when He comes,* but: *together, when He lives,* and that does not suit. Others (Lünemann) take ἅμα by itself, = יַחַד, *all together, one with another* (Rom. iii. 12);* and separate from it σὺν αὐτῷ; but Hofmann is right in connecting ἅμα σὺν αὐτῷ, as in ch. iv. 17; *together with Him,* united with Him. It may still be asked, whether the statement means: We are now already living in fellowship with Him, and they likewise who are asleep are joined to Him; or: In that day, when His life shall appear, we shall appear as living with Him, whether His coming finds us watching in life, or sleeping in death. But the latter view, it is obvious, brings the thought to a more completely satisfactory termination. Again, as compared with ἐσόμεθα (ch. iv. 17), the expression ζήσωμεν shows a fine, truly Pauline, advance: To be with Him will be the true life out of death.

6. (V. 11.) **Wherefore encourage [comfort] one another**; as in ch. iv. 18; only here, it would seem, the moral incitement to watchfulness is more prominent.† Lünemann finds the idea of consolation, after vv. 9 and 10, preponderant here also. In the Greek there is no such sundering of the two ideas.—**And** (as the consequence of the παρακαλεῖν) **edify one the other,** promote one another's establishment on the foundation laid. Grotius: *Monete verbis, ædificate exemplo;* but Jude 20 comprehends instruction and example. *One another;* he does not in the first instance urge official obligation, as if everything was to be turned over on that; rather, that follows first at v. 12. Εἷς τὸν ἕνα, along with ἀλλήλους, is good Greek. To read εἰς τὸν ἕνα ‡ is unnecessary, and indeed improper (see, against it, Lünemann).—**Even as also ye do,** comp. ch. iv. 10. Noble young church, where such things can be said! Calvin: With this addition he avoids the appearance of reproving them for negligence; and yet he has exhorted them, because human nature at all times needs the spur. Go on so! A pithy energy, a morning freshness, a joyous hopefulness, are observable throughout the entire section.

* [So Jowett, Alford, Ellicott, with others named in *Revision;* which see.—J. L.]

† [German: *sprechet einander zu;* whereas at ch. iv. 18 the phrase is, *tröstet einander.* See *Revision.*—J. L.]

‡ [*Revision:* "No edition has εἰς τὸν ἕνα, the construction adopted by Faber (*ad unum usque, to a man*), Whitby (*into one body*), Rückert (who understands by τὸν ἕνα, Christ)."—J. L.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. (Vv. 1–3.) In exact accordance with Christ's teaching, the Apostle declines all close definition or calculation of the times, and points instead to the signs, which the disciples of Christ are required to consider. For those secure in their ungodliness there are no signs; on them the thief comes suddenly, the pangs seize them all at once. But they themselves are for a sign to believers who watch and observe. It is the triumph of the cause of God, that even the despisers must render it the service of their testimony. Stupidity in Divine things, security and self-confidence, increase more and more; as it was, says Christ, in the days of Noah and Lot (Luke xvii. 26 sqq.). They ate, they drank, they married and were given in marriage; thus Jesus does not once upbraid them with the scandalous crimes which they committed, but with that very thing in their way of life which was commendable, but which becomes hideous, when nothing higher can be told of an age; when its whole life is a worldly life, in which God is no longer taken into the account. A great increase of outward power and culture, reliance on science, industry, the conquest of the external world, lead to an arrogance that no longer admits its dependence on God. *Les questions de disette ne sont que des questions de transport*, they sometimes say. And because the threatened judgment so long delays, people regard it as a fable; *mundum statuent æternum* (Bengel). But this is just a fulfilment of the prophecy, which gives previous indication of this very disposition.—Vietor: We will therefore carefully avoid saying: The Lord will come within such and such a time; He will come during our life on earth. But we will just as carefully avoid saying: He will not come during our life on earth.—How great is the injury done to the Christian hope by the first of these errors, in consequence of the rebuffs to which it is inevitably exposed, was made plain to many in the year 1836. It is, moreover, quite conceivable, that the course of historical revelation has somewhat changed the form of faith's expectation, and accustomed many to think more of the day of the individual's death than of the day of general judgment. The former, as well as the latter, comes on unavoidable, indeed, but unannounced. In this there is certainly a narrowing of the horizon, when regard to the universal consummation is too much lost. It were improper at each text to distinguish: Here the destruction of Jerusalem is meant; here the day of the individual's death; &c. The prophetic view rather comprehends all judgment under the figure of one day, and yet itself shows us that the fulfilment is distributed over a series of acts. Thus at one time (Rom. ii. 16), the prospect of the day of judgment is (without discrimination) held out also to the heathen, who yet, according to the complete scheme in the Apocalypse, do not appear before the judgment-seat till the last resurrection; at another time, on the contrary (John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54), the ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα (without the distinction of a first resurrection) is described as the day of resurrection for believers also. We say therefore, that with the Advent the last day appears; but how long and how far it shall reach, on that point there is nothing prejudged; and instead of unprofitable, if not pernicious, calculations, it is the observation of the signs that is helpful in the practical life.

2. (Vv. 4, 5.) The Scriptural ideas of light and darkness are quite different from those of the world. According to the latter, the thoughts become clear through enlightenment of the understanding, the life serene through art and culture; and very many revile the witnesses of the gospel as dullards who hinder the light, and the faith as a dark view of life. Now a truly evangelical sense will not shut itself in against any kind of knowledge. But (Heubner). The illumination, of which unbelief makes its boast, is darkness. The light of knowledge in Divine things is inseparably connected in reciprocal influence with the earnestness of sanctification; just as, *vice versa*, the corruption of the will and the blinding of the perception act reciprocally on each other.—Rieger: To be in darkness is to stick fast in ignorance, security, earthly-mindedness, indifference to the Lord Jesus, enmity against the light, repugnance to having one's hidden things come to the light, and in this condition to be willing to remain (John iii. 19 sqq.). But God is light, and begets us by the word of truth to be children of light, exciting in the hidden man a delight in the truth, which allows the evil there to be reproved by the light, and that which is wrought in God to be made manifest, thus withdrawing itself from the evil, and establishing itself on the good; and in this way is acquired a pure heart, and a single eye, to which the light is pleasant as its element, and so to a believer, as a child of light, even the day, which makes all clear, becomes supportable and desirable (1 John i. 5; James i. 17; John i. 4; viii. 12; Rom. xiii. 11 sqq.; 1 Cor. iii. 13; iv. 5; in the Old Testament, Is. ix. 1 sqq.; lx. 1 sqq.).—For Christians the day has already dawned inwardly, though it does not yet prevail without. As children of light, they are now already doing that which shall be their everlasting employment, in the day which will make all things manifest. But there is implied an earnest work of renewing, if a man is to rejoice, and not be alarmed, at such a manifestation (Matt. x. 26).—It is also too little thought of, how great is the dignity of our calling, that is expressed in the fact, that the highest splendor of earthly glory, even of that of the earthly intelligence, is described as dark night, when contrasted with the brightness that shall be revealed in us; *ov' è silenzio e tenebre la gloria che passò* (Manzoni).

3. (Vv. 6–8.) The exhortation: Ye are so and so by a Divine right, and know that ye are so; let us, then, also act accordingly! is peculiarly powerful. Just so Rom. vi. 11, 12; Col. iii. 3, 5. First: Reckon yourselves to be what the operation of God has made of you; the righteousness of faith, which He imputes to you, do ye also impute to yourselves; then: Walk also accordingly. By this resting on the work of God's grace the Sisyphus-toil of self-righteousness is abolished, and man is cheered, while at the same time his zeal also is stimulated. Here the exhortation is directed towards watchfulness and sobriety. From the tendency of the new nature, which has come into being through the Divine operation, proceeds watchfulness; and the task proposed is, that we cherish it by vigilance over ourselves, and so strive after a symmetrical and stable character. Intoxication, on the other hand, is an aggravation of the bias of the old nature, for which we ourselves are responsible. It arises from giving one's self up to worldly glory, to the honors and possessions, the enjoyments and cares, the doctrines and tendencies of those who ask not after God. In 1 Cor. xv. 34 the denial of the resurrection is described as a debauch.* It is a judgment, when God pours out to

* [Greek: ἐκνήψατε—"*Awake*" as from a fit of drunkenness.—J. L.]

a people the cup of trembling.* We should seek for holy, Divine reality, not ideal mist and foam of words. Whoever gives himself up to sleep and stupefaction, seeks for the night; that is, he screens and hides himself in the ruling power of the ungodly nature, attaching himself to companions of his own dark character. Where circumstances are suitable, and it is the hour of darkness, he gives his disposition the reins. An apostolic description of sobriety, on the other hand, we read in 1 Cor. vii. 29 sqq.

4. (V. 8.) Under the figure of armor, we have here a recommendation of faith, love, and hope, these three, as in 1 Cor. xiii.; faith and love, as having a peculiar intimacy of mutual connection, as in ch. i. 3; iii. 6. Theophylact refers the love to Christ and our fellow-men; Theodoret only to our neighbors, and in such a relation this might be more in accordance with Paul's usage (Gal. v. 6, 14; over against 1 John iv. 10, 19 sqq.). Faith lays hold of the forgiveness of sins, and the strength of Him who is stronger than the world (1 John iv. 4); love overcomes the evil with good (Rom. xii. 21), and precludes the rise of selfishness, bitterness, wrath, and hatred. The one cannot be without the other. Genuine faith is not a harsh dogmatism; it dwells only in a heart touched by the love of God, so that of necessity love grows out of it. A faith that does not justify itself in the way of love is not the genuine; it is a reliance on notions, instead of a personal trust in the God of grace; and through the inflation of knowledge it lays itself open to the enemy. A love, moreover, that loves not the life that is born of God (1 John v. 1, 2), but spares the ungodly nature, is not genuine love. Only where faith and love are really and intimately one, is the Christian heart (the centre of all inward and outward life) secured within the shelter of this breastplate against all condemnation, against all thrusts of the accuser, against all devilish assaults. And that the blows shall not reach the head, that the Christian is able without fainting to carry it aloft in suffering and affliction, that he should have the power, in steadfast endurance and with clear thought, of looking the enemy boldly in the eye—this comes to pass only when he is helmeted with the hope of an eternal consummation of salvation and deliverance. Deliverance from perdition—such is the Christian's salvation. Without the hope of it, faith and love also would be maimed. For a God that gave man no eternal hope were at the same time a God, that did not make Him the object of His eternal love, and would be no such God as man could personally trust in.

5. (Vv. 9-11.) Here again the work of God and man's doing are intimately conjoined, the former with the latter (see Note 3). By God's appointment Christ died for us, that we might live with Him. Through Jesus Christ we may and ought to make salvation our own. He has accomplished it, and on this foundation alone can there be any mention of our obtaining it. We do not, however, realize its benefits as a matter of course, *ex opere operato Jesu Christi*, but only when we allow what he has done *for* us to work *in* us. To this end is mutual exhortation directed.

6. (V. 11.) The Scriptural idea of edification is something different from the sickly, effeminate excitement of the feelings, that is spoken of here and there as edifying. The thing to be done is to build the temple of God, to establish it on the right foundation, to fashion and fit stone upon stone (1 Cor. iii. 16; viii. 10;* Eph. ii. 20 sqq.; 1 Pet. ii. 4 sqq.; Jude 20). Comp. Zahn, *Etwas über den biblischen Begriff der Erbauung*, Bremen, 1864. The question concerns the dwelling of God in humanity, and the mutual adjustment, therefore, of living stones for a habitation of the Spirit. This is, on the one side, a work of God, which becomes ever more inward; on the other side, it is man's labor, with an ever-growing fulness of earnestness, and with spiritual means throughout; both directed to the end that it may some day be said: Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men! (Rev. xxi. 3). By word and by walk should we further one another herein. But it is certain that many an occasion, when without being obtrusive we might exhort, comfort, edify our neighbors, is lost by us through shyness and sluggishness, for want of faith and love.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

V. 1. Zwingli: The Lord hides from us His day, that we may continually watch, and never relax through ease and the immoderate desire of pleasure; Calvin: that we may stand ever on the watch; [Burkitt: upon our watch every hour. . . . No hour when we can promise ourselves that He will not come.—J. L.]—Roos: Men frequently indulge a prying spirit in regard to truth submitted to them, and would know more than is needful for them.—Heubner: An unreasonable curiosity about that, which God has concealed, always betrays a heart not yet occupied with the man's concern.—Von Gerlach: Nowhere do the Apostles declare that the time is long.—Diedrich: There is here no use in fancies of all sorts, but much harm is easily done.

V. 2. Ye know perfectly, What? That the time cannot be known.—Quesnel: All knowledge respecting the day of judgment consists in believing, that we cannot know it. With this we must learn to be satisfied; it is really sufficient.—Stockmeyer: That the Lord cometh, let us hold all the more firmly in those very times, when there is the least appearance of such a thing ever happening.—To the careless it might be agreeable to know the hour when the thief comes, that they might sleep quietly till then, and have themselves wakened at the time. For such as love the Lord there is no need of knowing it; for He comes, indeed, unawares to them also, but not as a thief, but as a Friend and Saviour.—[If the approach of this day of the Lord is fitly compared to that of a thief in the night, stealing upon us we know not when, "at even, or at midnight, or at the cock-crowing, or in the morning" (Mark xiii. 35), this seems to preclude the idea of a thousand years of millennial glory before its arrival.—J. L.]

V. 3. Calvin: We regard as fabulous what does not at once meet our eyes.—Their thought is: It will not fare so ill with me; I shall be sure to look out for myself; am sharp enough.—Heubner: The treacherous peace of the unbeliever is founded on an absolute denial of the Divine judgment, or on the hope of its great remoteness. In this peace is involved the shocking consideration, that God is looked upon as an Enemy to be dreaded, with whom one is never happy but when let alone by Him.—Chrysostom: Seest thou how the devil has succeeded in making us our own enemies?—Livingstone

* [*Taumelbecher*—Luther's word at Zechariah xii. 2.—J. L.]

* [The word which our English Version here renders *emboldened* is οἰκοδομηθήσεται.—J. L.]

found negro tribes who cried: Give us sleep! when they meant peace; and the explanation of it is their dread of nocturnal assaults. But the Christian's peace must be a wakeful one.—*Berlenburger Bibel:* There is no surer snare of Satan, than when he is able to suggest mere thoughts of security. Of these is also that: God will not take matters so strictly; He is truly merciful.—Roos: The world would not be helped at all by an exact definition of the seasons and times; it would not believe them, and would sleep on in its darkness.—Stähelin: *If*, then, thou dost feel no disquiet, and dost perceive no danger, thy misery is so much the greater.—Disquiet the way to true quiet. [Barnes: One of the most remarkable facts about the history of man is, that he takes no warning from his Maker.—J. L.]

Starke: Here in the world the ungodly escape many a deserved punishment, since God looks on, and they who should have punished the wrong often fail to do so; but in that great judgment-day there will be no longer any forbearance.—Heubner: Here man has still the power of withdrawing himself from God, to wit, from God calling, warning, arousing; but whoever thus withdraws himself from Him, will fall into His hands as a Judge and an Avenger.—To flee from God, or to flee to Christ; such is the distinction between a wicked, worldly fear and the salutary fear of God.—Already the precursory judgments are frequently characterized by a sudden precipitation; so the flood, Sodom, Belshazzar.—Rieger: How much better and more advisable is it, to yield one's self to the salutary pangs of travail, in which a man is born again to a living hope!

[A spirit of indifference to this subject of the Lord's coming, no proof of piety or Christian wisdom. The topic was full of interest for the children of God in the apostolic age; and the grounds of that interest cannot have been impaired by the lapse of eighteen centuries.—J. L.]

V. 4. It is a strong consolation, when one can truly be reminded of the standing of a believer, wherein by the grace of God he is set.—Calvin: *Nulla densior caligo quam Dei ignorantia.*—Stockmeyer: The Lord's return breaks in on the horror of the darkness of sin, whether of a more refined or grosser form, like the clear, all-revealing day, when everything appears in the true light just as it is.—Christians, who can claim the Saviour as their own, are able to say: For us, He may come when He will; we are looking for Him all the time.—It is indeed a great thing to be in such a state of readiness, as is independent of all knowledge about the time and the hour.

Vv. 5, 6. Stockmeyer: Happy the church, to which it can be said: Ye are all of you children of light and children of day! Am I so likewise? How do we come to be so? no otherwise than by a judgment, when we allow ourselves to be judged by the light of God.—Zwingli: We are ashamed to act badly before men, and are not ashamed to sin before God. Such is our wickedness and folly. Where faith exists in force, we shall be more ashamed before the all-seeing God, who is the Eternal light, than if a man saw us.—He who seeks the darkness involuntarily betrays his inward feeling, that he is not yet hidden (Ps. cxxxix. 11, 12).—A special characteristic of the darkness is, that sins are no longer called by their own names.—*Berlenburger Bibel:* Wickedness must no longer be called wicked, but merely an infirmity.—Starke: The man who has not Christ, the Sun of righteousness, walketh in darkness.—But whoever inwardly walks in the light, for him the coming of the Lord serves to perfect his blessed condition with regard also to what is outward.—Stockmeyer: Blessed thought, that the perfect day is coming, when all darkness disappears, and we shall be altogether light.—[W. Jay: Three distinctions may be here made. *Heathens* are the children of *night*. . . . The *Jews* were all children of the *dawn*. . . . *Christians* are the children of the *day*.—Leighton: Base night-ways, such as cannot endure the light, do not become you. . . . O that comeliness which the saints should study, that decorum which they should keep in all their ways, εὐσχημόνως, one action like another, and all like Christ, living in the light . . . in the company of angels, of God, and Jesus Christ.—J. L.]

V. 6. [Watchfulness and sobriety; frequently thus joined together, and commonly also introduced in immediate reference to the coming of the Lord; comp. Matt. xxiv. 42 sqq.; Luke xxi. 34–36; Rom. xiii. 11–13; Phil. iv. 5; Tit. ii. 11–13; 1 Pet. i. 13.—Christian sobriety, not torpor or inactivity.—See John Howe's sermon on this verse.—J. L.]

V. 7. Eph. v. 11: Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness.—Luke xxi. 34; 1 Cor. v. 11; vi. 10; Rom. xiii. 13: Drunkenness too belongs there; not merely the figurative, but also the literal.—Zwingli: Wine in excess stirs up many a commotion and passion in the body; it is oil in the fire. Similar to it is the deliberate fostering of the passions generally.—Heubner: Drowsiness is contagious.—It drags down like a leaden weight; so likewise in what is spiritual. Criminal outbreaks are not the worst; insensibility for the things of God, forgetfulness of God, proud self-sufficiency are more wicked.

V. 8. Roos: Art thou watching? Art thou sober? Is it day or night with thee? What is most required is, that we regard ourselves and all outward things with a spiritual eye, and avoid filling and loading body and soul with eating and drinking, impotent science, proud conceits, cares, &c.

The Christian's position that of a soldier.—Rieger: With a warrior much depends on the inward courage and the confident self-possession; but, besides that, much also on the equipment assumed, and the use made of it.—Calvin: Against our powerful foe weapons are needed.—The same: *Semivictus est qui timide ac dubitanter pugnat.*—Chrysostom: Not even for one brief moment are we permitted to sleep; for at that very moment the enemy might come.—Stockmeyer: We are not at liberty to take our ease, to unclasp the breastplate, and lay aside the helmet; otherwise the enemy spies out the unguarded moment.—Zwingli: *Munimentum pectoris adeoque vitæ fides est.*—Roos: Art thou clothed with the armor of faith, if a trial or a doubt will disconcert thee? and with the armor of love, if an offence will exasperate thee?

Art thou impatient, when thou findest not thy satisfaction in the world? or hast thou put on the helmet of the hope of salvation?

[*Faith and love:*—An unloving faith, or a love that springs not from faith, no protection.—J. L.]

V. 9. Roos: God has not made us Christians, servants of His, partners of His kingdom, that we should still after all experience His wrath.—Stockmeyer: The day of the Lord is one of two things, a day of wrath or a day of salvation. [Burkitt: It is the greatest piece of folly imaginable, from the appointment of the end to infer the refusal or neg-

lect of the means.—W. JAY: *He has not appointed us to wrath.* He might have done it. We deserved it, &c. *But to obtain salvation.* Four things with regard to this appointment: the *earliness* of it—the *freeness* of it—its *efficiency*—its *appropriation.*—J. L.]

V. 10. CHRYSOSTOM: The mention of Christ's death shows us whence come our weapons, faith, love, hope.—[W. JAY: How well does the Apostle call the Redeemer "our life"! Three modes of expression: we are said to live *by* Him—*to* Him—*with* Him.—THE SAME: Proof of Christ's omnipresence and divinity;—the happiness of Christians.... Voltaire more than once says, in his letters to Madame du Deffand, "I hate life, and yet I am afraid to die." A Christian fears neither of these. He is willing to abide; and he is ready to go. Life is his. Death is his. Whether we wake or sleep, we shall live together with Him.—J. L.]

V. 11. HEUBNER: It is a rare thing to hear aught about people reminding one another of the last day. The warning voices are regarded as importunate disturbers and enthusiasts.—THEOPHYLACT: Dost thou object: "I am no teacher"? Teachers alone are not sufficient for the admonition of all.—STÄHELIN: Blessed therefore are the congregations, which in Christian order devoutly observe this rule. Blessed also the teacher, who is able on this point to commend his hearers.—That contempt for the teacher's office is not the right thing is shown presently, v. 12.

Vv. 9-11. [The source, the method, and the nature of the gospel salvation.—J. L.]

Vv. 1-11. This section is one of the pericopes for the so rarely occurring 27th Sunday after Trinity.—HEUBNER: Christian deportment in view of the last day: vv. 1-6, its nature; vv. 7, 8, grounds of obligation; vv. 9-11, blessed results.—KOLB: Most men are pleased with themselves. He whose eyes are opened knows that by reason of the fall we are by nature children of darkness, and only through regeneration are to become children of the light. Our high destination is, to go forth from the darkness, and press forward into light. God already looks on that as in existence, which is only in process of growth.

IV.

Closing Exhortations: to honor the presidents, to live in peace, to keep themselves free from all bitterness against persecutors, to unite vivacity with sobriety of spirit; ending with the prayer, that God may keep them.

CH. V. 12-24.

12 And [Now, *or:* But][1] we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labor
[those who toil, τοὺς κοπιῶντας] among you, and are over [preside over][2] you in
13 the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly [very exceed-
14 ingly][3] in love for their work's sake. *And* be [Be] at peace among yourselves.[4]
Now [*or:* But][5] we exhort you, brethren, warn [admonish][6] them that are
unruly [the disorderly],[7] comfort [encourage][8] the feeble-minded [faint-hearted],[9]
15 support the weak, be patient [be long-suffering][10] toward all *men* [all]. See that
none render evil for evil unto any *man* [any one, τινί]; but ever follow [always
pursue, πάντοτε . . . διώκετε] that which is good, both among yourselves, and to all
16 men [both toward one another, and toward all].[11] Rejoice evermore [always,
17, 18 πάντοτε]. Pray without ceasing. In everything give thanks: for this is
19 [*is*][12] the will of God [God's will][13] in Christ Jesus concerning you. Quench
20, 21 not the Spirit. Despise not prophesyings. Prove [But prove][14] all things;
22 hold fast that which is good. Abstain from all appearance [every form][15] of
23 evil. And the very God of peace [But may the God of peace Himself][16] sanctify you wholly; and *I pray God* your whole spirit, and soul, and body, be preserved blameless unto [and entire may your spirit and soul and body be kept
24 without blame at][17] the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Faithful *is* He that
calleth you; who also will do *it.*

[1] V. 12.—[δέ; transitional, or with a slightly adversative suggestion of the special urgency of this particular precept.—J. L.]

[2] V. 12.—[προϊσταμένους (Sin. A.: προϊσταυομένους), *stand before;* Germ. *vorstehen.*—J. L.]

[3] V. 13.—It is of no consequence, as regards the sense, whether we read with the Elzevir (also Sin.) ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ, or -ῶς (with B. D.[1] F. G.). [Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott.]

[4] V. 13.—The codd. A. B. D.[3] E. K. L., many minuscules, Copt., Goth., &c., give ἐν ἑαυτοῖς; but Sin., D.[1] F. G., Syr., Vulg. *cum eis,* &c., ἐν αὐτοῖς; Sin., *primâ manu,* even καὶ εἰρην. [the corrector cancels καί.—J. L]. See the exposition.

[5] V. 14.—[δέ; opposed perhaps to the idea, that peace (v. 13) was to be sought at the expense of purity and mutual faithfulness, or that the duty of admonition was confined to church officers (vv. 12, 13).—J. L.]

[6] V. 14.—[νουθετεῖτε; the same word as in v. 12; 2 Thess. iii. 15; &c.—J. L.]

[7] V. 14.—[τοὺς ἀτάκτους. *Revision:* "The only instance of ἄτακτος in the N. T., as our Second Epistle contains the only instance also of the kindred verb and adverb. E. V. margin; comp. 2 Thess. iii. 6, 7, 11."—J. L.]

[8] V. 14.—[*παραμυθεῖσθε*; comp. ch. ii. 11, Critical Note 22.—J. L.]

[9] V. 14.—[*ὀλιγοψύχους*. *Revision:* "Another N. T. *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*, though common in the Sept."—J. L.]

[10] V. 14.—[*μακροθυμεῖτε*. Comp. E. V. 2 Pet. iii. 9; 1 Cor. xiii. 4. The noun is almost always in our Version *long-suffering*.—J. L.]

[11] V. 15.—[*καὶ εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ εἰς πάντας*.] Before *εἰς ἀλλήλους* B. K. L. Sin.[2] [most of the cursives, Tischendorf's later editions, Alford, Wordsworth) give *καὶ*; but it is wanting in Sin.[1] A. D. E. F. G., versions, [Scholz, Schott, Lachmann, Ellicott.—The *ἀποδοῖ* of Sin.[1] was corrected in Sin.[2]—J. L.]

[12] V. 18.—[*Revision:* "Lachmann alone reads *γάρ ἐστιν*."—J. L.]

[13] V. 18.—[*θέλημα θεοῦ* (Sin.[1]; *τοῦ θεοῦ*) = one part of the Divine will; comp. ch. iv. 3.—J. L.]

[14] V. 21.—*δέ* after *πάντα* is given by most of the uncials [and critical editors; Riggenbach brackets it]; it is wanting only in A. Sin.[1], Copt., Syr., &c. See the exposition.

[15] V. 22.—[*παντὸς εἴδους*. See the exposition.—J. L.]

[16] V. 23.—[*Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης*. Comp. ch. iii. 11, Critical Note 8, and the foot-note to Exeg. Note 9; also here Exeg. Note 6.—J. L.]

[17] V. 23.—[*καὶ ὁλόκληρον* (found again at James i. 4; here belongs to the predicate) *ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀμέμπτως ἐν . . . τηρηθείη*. On this last word it is remarked in my *Revision* of Jude 1: "The verb *τηρέω* occurs 75 times in the N. T., . . . and in E. V. is 58 times rendered *to keep*; only here and 1 Thess. v. 23, *to preserve*. Wherever, as in this verse, it is used of believers, I prefer to translate it *to keep*, not so much on the general ground of uniformity, as on account of the large use of that term in the same connection in our Lord's high-priestly prayer (John xvii.). The present safety of the Church is the Father's answer to the Son."—J. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. (Vv. 12, 13.) **Now** [or, **But**. See Critical Note 1.—J. L.] **we beseech you**, &c.—The closing section contains exhortations, which are improperly described [De Wette, Lünemann] as miscellaneous. It is no fortuitous selection, but we recognize an order and purpose. It is natural that in the Apostle's closing exhortations there should always be much that is generally available; but in every case the selection proves to be singularly appropriate to the particular exigency, short and striking, every sentence weighty (comp. Rom. xii. and other places). In our passage Paul passes (*δέ*, see Lünemann) from what all ought to do (v. 11) to that which peculiarly concerns the presidents, on whom especially devolves the office of exhortation and edification; Chrysostom: that they might not suppose, that he would raise all to the dignity of teachers; Hofmann: but in your activity forget not what you owe to the office; *ἐρωτῶμεν*, as ch. iv. 1; he begs, where the question is about the presidents, whereas he exhorts, v. 14, when urging upon them their own active duties; he has nothing of the hierarchical temper. Perhaps their neglect of the presidents was connected with the excitement of enthusiasm (ch. iv. 11); he was not willing to have this spread; sobriety (ch. v. 6 sqq.) was to be shown in this direction also. The presidents are not designated by their official titles (*πρεσβύτεροι* or *ἐπίσκοποι*), but by a brief indication of their functions; *who labor, take pains; κοπιᾶν* denotes severe labor, whereby one is wearied; for that very reason they deserve recognition. Here it is not added as in 1 Tim. v. 17, *in word and doctrine;* and without this addition the expression has a wider reach, embracing the performance of all service. Ἐν ὑμῖν can mean *on you* (Hofmann, Winer, § 48. a. 3) or *among you, in your circle;* not, *in your hearts* (Pelt), for that is not man's business. The *κοπιᾶν* is defined by what follows; for *προΐστασθαι* and *νουθετεῖν* cannot refer to other persons, officers, classes, since participle is joined to participle by a simple *καί*; under the one article are included statements respecting the same persons; they who labor and preside and admonish are one and the same; the same work is conceived of on different sides: in regard to the exertion of the individuals themselves it is a *κοπιᾶν*; in its relation to the church, a *προΐστασθαι*; in application to the erring, a *νουθετεῖν*. They preside over you **in the Lord**, since they themselves live in Him; therefore also their work is in Him, in His strength, and a presiding, guiding, overseeing in His behalf; they are no civil magistracy. [Webster and Wilkinson: "*ἐν* K., added as the highest sanction, and at the same time limitation of their authority."—J. L.] Unsuitable and not correspondent to the word is the explanation of Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others: *who intercede for you with God in prayer;* that were rather *ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπέρ τινος*. Finally, *νουθετεῖν* is properly *to correct one's ideas*, and so *to admonish, remind, warn;* to this submit yourselves. Nor is that even in later times the business of another office (against Olshausen), but merely a special side of the presidency: the exercise of discipline for the prevention of errors. [Webster and Wilkinson: "By the use of participles instead of nouns of office, ministers as *exercising* rather than as *having* certain functions, are represented as the objects of regard."—J. L.] These men—such is his request—ye ought *εἰδέναι*, pregnant: *respicere, to recognize and acknowledge them as being what they are;* like *ἐπιγινώσκειν*, 1 Cor. xvi. 18, and Prov. xxvii. 23, Septuagint for ידע; indeed, ידע is translated also by *εἰδέναι*, when the meaning is *to interest one's self in a matter* (Gen. xxxix. 6);—no doubt, a different case from one in which there is a personal object. But it is unquestionably harsher, when Ewald, declining the pregnant signification of *εἰδ.*, supposes that what is to be known about them is first resumed in *ἡγεῖσθαι*, &c. Hofmann understands it thus: *You should know how it is with them, what you have in them;* Stockmeyer: *what position they hold.* But Pelt alone introduces the idea of showing gratitude to them by a stipend.*—**And to esteem them very exceedingly**, &c.; still dependent on *ἐρωτῶμεν*. According to the two interpretations that are here possible, *ἡγεῖσθαι*, &c. is somewhat harsh and without any quite analogous example; either (Theodoret, Grotius [and many others]): *to esteem them exceeding highly*, and that (modal definition of this esteem) *in love*, therefore not in fear, or such like sentiments; but elsewhere *ἡγεῖσθαι* (with an accusative) means *to take one to be something*, not, by itself, *to esteem highly;* this would require the addition of *περὶ πολλοῦ, π. πλείστου*, and for that *ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ* can hardly answer. Besides,

* [Ellicott: "*To know, regard, recognise fully.* No instance of a similar or even analogous usage has, as yet, been adduced from classical Greek."—*Revision:* "*Be not strangers to them—their calling and work—their necessities and trials.* What follows in v. 13 would be the result of the knowledge. There is no need, therefore, of straining the common meaning of the verb into *acknowledge, recognize, care for, take an interest in, regard with favor, reverence*, &c., as is commonly done in the commentaries, versions, and lexicons. The other ordinary references, in behalf of this alleged Hebraism in the use of *εἰδέναι*, will be found on examination to be, very often at least, delusive. . . . Indeed, the Hebrew ידע itself is frequently misinterpreted in the same direction."—J. L.]

it is then quite too tautological with εἰδέναι. Rather, therefore, with CHRYSOSTOM: ἡγεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ τῇ ὑμῶν ὀφείλειν εἶναι, ἡγ. αὐτ. ἀξίους τοῦ ἀγαπᾶσθαι (THEOPHYLACT: thou lovest him who secures for thee an entrance into the kingdom of heaven), or PELT: *in carissimorum eos loco habete;* and just so LÜNEMANN, HOFMANN: *hold them in love,* like ἔχειν τινὰ ἐν ὀργῇ (Thucyd. ii. 18). Thus, along with respect (v. 12) he recommends (v. 13) the highest love,* although, nay, rather *because*, they admonish you.—**For their work's sake**; the indolent, therefore, have no claim, but they who faithfully perform the serious work for souls. [ELLICOTT: "on account both of the importance of the work (Heb. xiii. 17), and the earnest and laborious manner in which it was performed; comp. Phil. i. 22; ii. 30."—J. L.]—**Be at peace among yourselves**, ἐν ἑαυτοῖς equivalent to ἐν ἀλλήλοις, John vii. 35; for the matter, Mark ix. 50 is to be compared. The variation ἐν αὐτοῖς (which arose probably from the brevity of the sentence, that seemed unable to stand independently) is followed by CHRYSOSTOM, THEODORET (*contradict not what they say*), THEOPHYLACT, LUTHER (*be at peace with them*), ZWINGLI, CALVIN and others. ZWINGLI: *Be well content with them;* but he proposes also the explanation: *In them* (*through them*) *ye have peace.* But the connection leads us to expect an imperative; had the word been meant to be indicative, it would have been said: ἐν αὐτοῖς γὰρ εἰρ. But the reference to the teachers is not good; 1. ἐν would not suit well; μετά (as in Rom. xii. 18) would in that case be the right word; 2. an exhortation to peace with the presidents would almost necessarily imply a previous quarrel with them, which is at least improbable; 3. lastly, towards presidents the question would not be merely to keep the peace, but to be obedient to them in the Lord. Better, therefore, according to the reading, ἐν ἑαυτοῖς; *among yourselves.* This exhortation is connected indirectly (DE WETTE) with the preceding. Peace in the church (like brotherly love, ch. iv. 9 sqq.) was most threatened, when any showed themselves meddlesome, neglected ἡσυχάζειν, πράσσειν τὰ ἴδια, &c., and for that reason did not, it is probable, sufficiently esteem the presidents. On the other hand, deference to the presidents and compliance with their exhortations promoted the peace of all. Since the foes of peace are within in every heart, such an exhortation was salutary, even though there were no serious disagreements on foot. Undoubtedly that by which peace was most threatened was the ἀτακτεῖν, to which he forthwith proceeds.

2. (V. 14.) **Now** [or, **But**—see Critical Note 5.—J. L.] **we exhort you**, &c.—Esteem for their presidents and peace among themselves should and will lead to proficiency in their tasks: 1. in reference to the faults which still cleave to the brethren (v. 14); 2. in relation to their enemies (v. 15); in both relations be directs them, 3. to the right disposition toward God (vv. 16–18), and therefore also toward the gifts of His Spirit (v. 19 sqq.).—At v. 14, as at v. 11, he exhorts all the brethren; for it is a mistake to regard the exhortation, with CHRYSOSTOM, THEOPHYLACT [CONYBEARE], and others, as addressed to the presidents. Truly spiritually minded Christians will, indeed, yield themselves to the guidance of the presidents (vv. 12, 13), but will themselves also (v. 14) assist them in the same spirit. The Apostle is far from entertaining extravagant ideas of office. He immediately reverts to what all have to do; the difference from v. 11 consists in this, that Paul now treats particularly of the manner of dealing with the erring, or the in some way weaker members.—**Admonish the disorderly**; not altogether, in general, those who live in the violation of the commandments of God (CHRYSOSTOM: all sinners are ἄτακτοι; THEOPHYLACT: he who in any way infringes order, the drunken, the slanderers, the covetous), but here probably in the narrower sense that appears in ch. iv. 11, 12; also 2 Thess. iii. 6, 11, ἀτάκτως περιπατεῖν, v. 7, ἀτακτεῖν; ἄτακτος, *inordinatus* (Livy), is the soldier who keeps not his rank and file; then, by transference, whoever forsakes his τάξις, place, rank, station; whoever quits the straight track, driving round irregularly and aimlessly. There were such in this flourishing church.—**Encourage** (ch. ii. 11) **the faint-hearted**; ὀλιγοψ., Septuagint for various Hebrew words, Is. liv. 6; lvii. 15; μικροψυχεῖν also occurs. We think first (so already THEODORET) of those who grieved for the dead (ch. iv. 13 sqq.); HOFMANN will not allow this, because theirs was a case, not of faint-heartedness, but of error; still the error resulted in faint-heartedness, and they therefore needed to be cheered with comforting truth (ch. iv. 18). No doubt, however, there might be yet other desponding persons, to whom, when under persecution, Christianity seemed too grievous a thing (as in like manner THEODORET; THEOPHYLACT: who could not endure trial); or tempted persons, whose thought was: For me there can be no forgiveness.—**Support the weak**; ἀντέχεσθαι, *to hold fast to something, adhærere;* Tit. i. 9, to cleave to the word; Matt. vi. 24, to one's master; and so here: to the weak, as a precious treasure; but also in Prov. iv. 6 Septuagint for נצר: Wisdom will keep thee, will adhere to thee as a protector. HOFMANN: Take pains with them, instead of despising them; a contrast like that in Matt. vi. The temptation would be to become weary of the feeble, as people that are continually making new trouble for us, without ever reaching a definite result. But this would be a dangerous self-pleasing (Rom. xv. 1 sqq.). The word ἀσθενεῖς might mean the sick (1 Cor. xi. 30), but also those without spiritual strength, the weak in faith and conscience, who do not get forward (1 Cor. viii. 10; ix. 22; Rom. xiv. 1); and to this we are led here by the context; the disorderly and the faint-hearted are single instances, but to be weak shows itself in still another form. It is very conceivable that in so young a church there were yet people who, like young children, easily stumbled, and in whom the old things continued still to work. They might become weakest, when they thought themselves strong (1 Cor. viii. and x.). The opposite quality is denoted by ἀνδρίζεσθε, κραταιοῦσθε (1 Cor. xvi. 13), or again by the ὑγιαίνειν of the Pastoral Epistles.—The most general precept comes last: **Be long-suffering toward all**; as love acts (1 Cor. xiii. 4; comp. הֶאֱרִיךְ אַפּוֹ, Prov. xix. 11; Sept.). Patience allows time for the growth of the godly man. A necessary exhortation for such as are yet young Christians, who are apt to be young also in their zeal. *Toward all*—THEODORET, OLSHAUSEN, LÜNEMANN [ALFORD, ELLICOTT] would understand this, as in v. 15, of all men; HOFMANN [JOWETT] would take the clause in immediate connection with

* [And so LÜNEMANN, ELLICOTT;—but the accuracy of the remark depends on the real import of εἰδέναι.—J. L.]

v. 15. But ὁρᾶτε, &c. indicates a new start, whereby he passes to the true Christian treatment of all men; whereas in v. 14 it is still the behavior of Christians to one another that is spoken of; and so THEOPHYLACT even refers the expression (only somewhat too strictly) to the three classes before mentioned. Therefore: Be long-suffering toward all, the disorderly, the faint-hearted, the weak, and whoever else in the church requires your patience (DE WETTE). Who does not? [WEBSTER and WILKINSON: certain classes required particular treatment, all required patience.—J. L.]

3. (V. 15.) **See**, be careful, be on your guard (Matt. viii. 4); βλέπετε also occurs in this sense; see to it, heedfully, for it is not an easy matter (CALVIN); **that none render evil for evil unto any one** (1 Pet. iii. 9; Rom. xii. 17; Matt. v.). Not merely, therefore, that ye do not violate μακροθυμία, in an excessive, spiritual zeal, but also that no one, as quite commonly happens, give way to the revengeful disposition of the old man; toward any brother or non-Christian, possibly a persecutor. CHRYSOSTOM, THEOPHYLACT: If we are not to return evil, then so much the less should we begin by giving evil for good.—Alas, that there is ever fresh need of such exhortations! But Paul does not say: μή τις ὑμῶν, and from this DE WETTE infers that it is taken for granted, that a spirit of revenge is so unworthy of true Christians, that to them it is merely said: Guard against its breaking out elsewhere even in others. This LÜNEMANN rejects, 1. because Paul could not have supposed, that with those who had been heathens vindictiveness was something so entirely laid aside, since it was rather a new, specifically Christian commandment, to avoid it; 2. because, therefore, all needed for themselves the exhortation to vigilance and self-conquest, whereas 3. it is but seldom that one is able to restrain others. Nevertheless it may still be asked: Why does Paul not employ the second person plural? DE WETTE is somewhat too one-sided; μή τις admits of both applications, to every one for himself, and to the warning of others; HOFMANN compares Heb. iii. 12; iv. 1; xii. 15; and even among Christians no one is perfectly secure against fits of revengefulness. Accordingly: Let every one look to both himself and others; the discreet is to restrain the passionate. Most judiciously BENGEL: He who is incensed by wrongs is prejudiced; therefore should others see to it, and seek to moderate him.*—**But always pursue that which is good**—not merely what is salutary, useful (OLSHAUSEN), what is good for one (HOFMANN), *alienis commodis* (GROTIUS), nor yet beneficence (PELT), but what is right before God (the opposite: κακόν), morally good (Rom. xii. 9, 21). Of course, this is also beneficial to one's neighbor; the special application of what is morally good to our neighbor consisting in those offices of love, which are to be rendered to him (STARKE). The good is just everything that furthers the triumph of truth and love. Aim at doing this even to him who injures you. Paul does not always move in such generalities and abstractions (to do good for the sake of good, and such like); but to rich, concrete, particular exhortations he subjoins these comprehensive and simplest fundamental principles (comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 7, and often). To attain to this (amidst manifestations of enmity) requires a διώκειν. We must pursue that which is good, it does not naturally belong to us; the evil, on the contrary, comes of itself (comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 1, *follow after charity:* Heb. xii. 14, *peace and holiness*).—**Toward one another,** that means the brotherly love of Christians (ch. iv. 9, 10); **and toward all,** even non-Christians (ch. iii. 12); here the opposition is expressed. *What is good;* that is still more than what is becoming (ch. iv. 12).

4. (Vv. 16–18.) **Rejoice always** [2 Cor. vi. 10; Phil. iii. 1; iv. 4.—J. L.].—Whether you attain the end with your neighbor or not, do you pursue after it, so much as lieth in you (Rom. xii. 18), and, for your own part, rejoice evermore; THEODORET: even in poverty, sickness, contumely, torture, prison; as those for whom all things work together for good (Rom. viii. 28). Here he speaks of the right disposition, no longer toward men, but before God. All that goes before is to be attained only when this peace rules within. Should there be a failure of joy because of the difficulty of overcoming evil with good, then raise yourselves above all that depresses you by prayer.—**Pray without ceasing** (ch. i. 3; ii. 13; Rom. i. 9). Already CHRYSOSTOM and THEOPHYLACT recognize the connection: τὴν ὁδὸν ἔδειξε. *Without ceasing;* this does not mean, with a continual, indolent folding of the hands; as Paul prayed night and day (ch. iii. 10), so likewise he labored night and day (ch. ii. 9); and yet he had also intervals of sleep! The next thing is therefore obvious: Never omit the practice of prayer; be as regularly diligent therein as in labor. This then infers a constant spirit of prayer, breathing through the whole life. But in order to the stirring up (2 Tim. i. 6) of this, and so to the quickening of joy, he exhorts further: **in everything give thanks**; BENGEL: even in what seems adverse. Give thanks for the great grace already received (comp. Col. iv. 2; Phil. iv. 6). In the last place we find in like manner ἐν παντί. This is not the same thing as πάντοτε (which stands with it at 2 Cor. ix. 8), for καιρῷ should not have been wanting; but it means, *in every point, every matter* or *situation*, equivalent to κατὰ πάντα, περὶ παντός, ὑπὲρ πάντων (Eph. v. 20).—**For this is* God's will,** &c. (ch. iv. 3); not *the* will, since that of course includes more than this one point. The subject is τοῦτο, *this*, the giving thanks in everything; GROTIUS [SCHOTT]: *prayer and thanksgiving;* but in that case we should have to go still a step further, and, with VON GERLACH [CORN. A LAPIDE, JOWETT, ALFORD, MÖLLER] bring in also the *rejoicing;* not quite everything from v. 14, for that is not so homogeneous that it could well be embraced in τοῦτο as one topic. In consideration also of the fact that ἐν παντὶ εὐχαριστεῖτε is added by asyndeton, it may well seem more advisable to refer the τοῦτο, with BENGEL, only to the giving of thanks, which indeed is the means of quickening prayer and joy. HOFMANN: The interruption of the exhortations takes place, where one of them is specially confirmed. On the predicate BENGEL remarks: *Voluntas semper bona, semper spectans salutem vestram in Christo.* But not as CALVIN gives the turn: Of such a nature is God's gracious will in Christ, that we have therein abundant cause for thanksgiving; but: God's will is *this*, that we give thanks, and this will of God is established in Christ, mediated through Him; Christ strengthens us to give thanks, because in Him all things are ours (1

* [BENGEL's own Latin: *Quisque custodiat et se et alterum. Læsus, qui in fervore est, nimium videt; ergo proximi videre debent.*—J. L.]

* Only LACHMANN reads γάρ ἐστιν.—J. L.]

Cor. iii. 21 sqq.), all things work together for good (Rom. viii. 28), all things help forward the subdual of the flesh and the relief of the spirit. Finally *εἰς ὑμᾶς*, *quoad vos*, toward you, in reference to you.

5. (Vv. 19–22.) **Quench not the Spirit.**—From prayer and thanksgiving he passes to the source from which they flow; a right frame of heart toward God should show itself in the right use of His choicest gifts; in a proper bearing toward the manifestations of the Spirit in the life of the Church;—a supplement to v. 14, where the defects of the church and their proper treatment had been touched upon. The Spirit is He who is received from God (ch. iv. 8; 1 Cor. ii.; Gal. iii.), and who, working in original fulness and freshness, distributes manifold gifts (1 Cor. xii.); the connection with v. 20 points in this direction. CALVIN: *Spiritus genus, prophetia species.* Quench—literally, extinguish—Him not; the sacred fire; comp. Rom. xii. 11, *τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες*, and 2 Tim. i. 6, *ἀναζωπυρεῖν*; THEOPHYLACT: In the night of this life God gave us the Spirit for a light. But WETSTEIN shows by many examples that *σβέννυμι* is used also of the stilling of a wind. The fire is nourished by prayer, thanksgiving, exercise; is quenched by neglect or suppression, by want of wood or by pouring on water; VON GERLACH: by contempt, suspicion, a fleshly mind, contradiction or inattention; CALVIN: by unthankfulness. But a still more precise question is this: Does it mean: Stifle not the Spirit in yourselves by impurity of doctrine and life? or suppress not the Spirit's utterances, when they meet you in the church? The connection with v. 20 leads to the second explanation; it being always understood, that to decline the Spirit's influences in our own hearts renders us also averse to what we meet with in others of His extraordinary movements. This disaffection might work not only against prophesying, v. 20, but generally against the most various manifestations of the Spirit. But, when DE WETTE conjectures that there were, in particular, timid, pusillanimous presidents, who, because they saw with regret the spiritual excitement, restrained those inspired from coming forward, there is no satisfactory evidence of this. The exhortation is quite general in its tone (v. 27 will bring us to a similar question). Altogether unsuitable is OLSHAUSEN's inference from our passage, that Paul can therefore have had no misgiving about the Thessalonians being in danger of becoming a prey to enthusiasm, according to the subsequent indications of the Second Epistle. No; Paul knew how matters stood; he admonished the disorderly; he exhorted to careful examination; but surely he could not write: Quench the Spirit! On the contrary, HOFMANN will not allow, that there existed in Thessalonica a partial disinclination to spiritual utterances; Paul, he thinks, would merely regulate their bias towards what was extraordinary, the main emphasis being on the after-clause, *prove all things.* This may be too exclusive on the other side. How easily, in presence of enthusiasm and even false prophesying, might a distrust of everything out of the common course take possession of other minds! Paul corrects both the one tendency and the other. So already THEODORET: Some wished, on account of the false prophets, to stop also the true.—One particular instance of spiritual manifestations is mentioned in v. 20: **Despise not prophesyings** (where they occur). The word stands without the article, in the plural, denoting the individual cases. Prophesying does not respect the future merely (though this also is not excluded, Acts xxi. 10 sqq.), but is an utterance of Divine mysteries; *mysteriorum retectio et præsentium et futurorum*, PELT; a speaking to the church under a special influence of the Spirit, but with clear consciousness, and thus distinguished from the speaking with tongues; on the other side, it is not one and the same thing with teaching, the reflective development of thought; but a speaking from Divine inspiration, affecting hearts with a thrilling power, strengthening them with the fulness of consolation, unfolding the mysteries of judgment and of grace in the administration of the kingdom and in the sway of individual hearts. At all times one prophet has connected with the word of another; still mere exposition is not prophesying; to the latter belongs somewhat of originality; but this shows itself as well in the elucidation of the past (prophetic history), as in the spiritual flashes that disclose what is coming (comp. 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28; xiv., especially vv. 24, 25; Eph. iv. 11; Rom. xii. 6; Acts xi. 27; xiii. 1; xv. 32; xix. 6). This gift *despise not*, old Greek *ἐξουδενεῖν*; *-όω* likewise occurs (Mark ix. 12, various reading); the Swiss *vernüte* answers exactly in etymology and import. Other gifts might be more brilliant, although this also, 1 Cor. xiv. 1, 39, is especially commended. The disaffection probably proceeded rather in undue resistance from the intellect and love of order; not, as in Corinth, from an overvaluing of the *γλῶσσαι.* Not to despise, however, does not mean to receive without judgment and blindly. Hence: **Prove all things.** The variations, *πάντα, πάντα δὲ, δοκιμάζοντες*, instead of *-ζετε*, and lastly *καὶ τὸ καλόν*, seem to lead back to the asyndeton, *πάντα δοκιμάζετε*, as the simplest reading. But should the preponderance of authorities be deemed decisive in favor of the addition of *δέ*, the sentence would stand in opposition to what goes before, and the two following sentences would be arranged by the trial enjoined into 1. Hold fast that which is good, and 2. Abstain from the evil. *Prove*, the command is to all Christians, not to a privileged class.* The object of the trial is to be *all things;* primarily, according to the context, what the prophets say. The word has come to be a peculiarly trite commonplace, in which the second half of the verse is frequently forgotten: **Hold fast that which is good**, fair, noble; what furthers you in the Divine life—what amongst the *πάντα* (primarily in the prophesyings) you find excellent—that hold fast, in opposition to the *ἐξουδενεῖν.* A point of peculiar importance, however, is, not merely *what*, according to the Apostle, is to be proved, but especially *how.* The object is everything that claims to be spiritual, as in 1 Cor. xiv. 29 also it is precisely to what the prophets say that the direction applies: *διακρινέτωσαν.* There is, therefore, no fanatical demand for a blind submission, not even to the apostolic word (1 Cor. vii. and x. 15). Of so much the greater consequence is it to be certain that we really possess the true Divine criterion. What that is, Paul does not say; but plainly it is none other than what they had received from him and through the Spirit had made their own, the apostolic word of truth, originating with the Spirit, and sealed by the Spirit (ch. ii. 13;

* [ELLICOTT would apply it "more restrictedly to those who had the special gift" of the discernment of spirits. But the limitation is not in the text, nor is it required. The church might properly be exhorted to do as a church what she was enabled to do effectively in the exercise of her own special endowments.—J. L.]

iv. 1, 2; 2 Thess. ii. 5; iii. 4, 5); answering to the anointing of 1 John ii. 27. The trial of the spirits is a special charism (1 Cor. xii. 10; comp. Heb. v. 14). See more under the Doctrinal and Ethical head, No. 4.—To πάντα δοκιμάζετε CYRIL of Alexandria prefixes the words, γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι τραπεζῖται (money-changers, *argentarii*, *nummularii*). In the other Fathers this sentence is, γ. δόκιμοι τραπ.; and from this arises a telling contrast: Be proved yourselves, that you may be able to prove (comp. HÄNSEL, in the *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1836, I.). This expression is ascribed generally to Holy Writ by CLEMENT of Alexandria and the *Constit. Apost.*; to Jesus in particular, by JEROME, EPIPHANIUS; to the Apostles, by DIONYSIUS of Alexandria; to Paul (in connection with 1 Thess. v.), by ORIGEN, BASIL, and especially by CYRIL. Does it come from some apocryphal book? rather, it is a ῥῆμα ἄγραφον. Such is HÄNSEL's view, who thinks that it may at any rate have been in the Apostle's mind, and that δοκιμάζετε is to be explained by the technical language of exchangers, as also εἶδος in v. 22: *Abstain from every sort of bad money.* But unless money-changers and coins had been expressly spoken of, it could occur to no one to think of that; especially not, that εἶδος without νομίσματος, and that too in the second member, instead of the first, could signify a kind of money. We therefore hold to the more general signification.—But what is the meaning of v. 22? The Vulgate: *ab omni specie mala*, is still itself ambiguous. LUTHER: *Avoid every evil appearance;* so also CALVIN, GROTIUS [WORDSWORTH, WEBSTER and WILKINSON]; the English Version, *from all appearance of evil;* the Dutch, *van allen schijn des kuaads;* Martin and Ostervald, *de toute apparence de mal.* This were an altogether beautiful sense: What is finally to be regarded is the εὐσχημόνως περιπατεῖν (comp. ch. iv. 12); it is perhaps impossible for the Christian always to avoid every evil appearance, but to the best of his ability he is to do so. LÜNEMANN objects that this would imply on the other side: *Hold fast merely the appearance of what is good;* but that does not follow, inasmuch as the opposition might include the climax: Even from that which should have only an appearance of evil we are willingly to abstain, in order to give no offence. RIEGER: That we may not forfeit the confidence of others; but first we are to accept what is proved to be good. Still this interpretation must be rejected, as violating the expression; that is to say, εἶδος means *form*, *aspect*, then *kind*, *species*,* (Jer. xv. 3, Sept.), as a subdivision of the *genus;* but not *appearance.* Then, to *avoid an evil appearance* would not suit the matter here spoken of, namely the trial of prophesyings. It would be an independent sentence, introducing something altogether new, whereas evidently πονηρός stands opposed to καλός, and ἀπέχεσθε to κατέχετε, as the two sides, the negative and the positive, of δοκιμάζειν. For LÜNEMANN's idea is plainly too refined, that, because we have not simply ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ, v. 22 cannot form the antithesis to v. 21, but must contain a more general thought. Why should not Paul be able slightly to modify and intensify the expression? We shall see with what good reason. HILGENFELD is unwilling to understand εἶδος in the sense of *kind;* that would be too flat; it should rather signify *spectacle*, *figure*, and be referred to the shameful and seductive exhibitions of heathenism. Already in like manner Roos thinks that what is meant is an image that seizes the mind, fantasticalness. But in this way also the connection would be given up, and the idea limited to some single matter, of which one does not of one's own accord readily think; whereas the context lends to the seemingly general idea a more specific import. Still it may be asked whether πονηροῦ, because without the article, belongs as an adjective to εἴδους (BENGEL, SCHOTT, PELT), or as a substantive depending on εἴδους. The former construction would be advisable only in case the expression already implied, of what things the εἶδος is intended, and those things such as that their good εἴδη are distinguishable from the bad. It is better, therefore, to take it, with DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN [JOWETT, ALFORD, ELLICOTT] and others, as a substantive (comp. Heb. v. 14, πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ, also without article; comp. JOSEPH. *Ant.* x. 3. 1, πᾶν εἶδος πονηρίας; HOFMANN refers also to PLATO, *Rep.* p. 357 c., ὁρᾷς τε εἶδος ἀγαθοῦ [to which may be added CHRYSOST. *Hom.* viii. on this Epistle, οὐδέν ἐστιν εἶδος κακίας ὅπερ ἀτόλμητον.—J. L.]. So the antithesis is: *Hold fast that which is good* (the good is one); *from every kind of evil abstain* (the evil has various εἴδη, and hence the climax); even from the seemingly spiritual kind of evil; THEODORET: as well in doctrine as in conduct. Even that which comes forward as prophesying, or generally as a spiritual gift, is to be proved; even that kind of evil, which asserts itself under sacred pretexts, you are to avoid. There is evil of a human, natural, fleshly sort, but also of a demoniacal (comp. 2 Cor. xi. 14).

6. (Vv. 23, 24.) **But may the God of peace Himself**, &c.—A contrast both as to the subject and the predicate, as ch. iii. 11; iv. 16; not you alone have to do this, nor could you so accomplish it, but God must effect it; and that not merely here a κατέχειν, and there an ἀπέχεσθαι—not isolated acts merely—but the main comprehensive work of life, your sanctification and preservation to the end. He is called the God of peace, its Lord, Author, Source, Rom. xv. 33; xvi. 20; similar combinations in Rom. xv. 5, 13. Everything advanced in vv. 14–22 is here taken together, and brought into view as all aiming at true peace. And truly the work of God, whereby he guides us to peace, is our sanctification, and, through that, our preservation to the Advent. Our sanctification is, indeed, His will (ch. iv. 3, 7); our entire surrender to His will and service;—a thing which He alone can achieve, to wit, by His Holy Spirit (ch. iv. 8). Already has it begun; in their principles Christians are ἅγιοι; but it is only by slow degrees that perfect sanctification pervades all their powers. And this consummation marks the advance in our passage as compared with ch. iii. 13. In what follows BENGEL distinguishes between *universi* (all without exception) *et singuli* (every one entirely); but that does not lie particularly in the first clause. Ὁλοτελεῖς, in the New Testament ἅπαξ λεγ., means either: *you as complete, entire, so that no sort of evil is in you;* LUTHER: *through and through;* or (PELT and others): *May He sanctify you to be a perfect people*—accusative of operation; with this verb without example. This word, no less than ὁλόκληρον, may suggest the faultlessness of sacrifice. The latter is equivalent to *integer;* at James i. 4 it stands with τέλειος; in the Septuagint for שָׁלֵם, תָּמִים; *and unhurt, in all parts unin-*

* [So the great majority of the best interpreters. See *Revision*.—J. L.]

jured, may your spirit, &c. *be kept*, &c. De Wette, Olshausen, and Lünemann would understand it quantitatively, to distinguish it from ἀμέμπτως: *every part by itself entirely, all spotless.* But ὁλόκλ. denotes the quality,* the full healthy life, comp. ὁλοκληρία in the healing of the lame man (Acts iii. 16), and is yet sufficiently distinct from ἀμέμπτως, 1. as a positive expression opposed to the negative; 2. as marking the nature of the subject itself, over against what expresses the verdict of the Judge; and lastly, 3. since ὁλοκληρία is a predicate, whereas the adverb ἀμέμπτως is to be understood as qualifying the verb. On the latter point most interpreters do not clearly express themselves, or they take the adverb as if it were an adjective, comparing perhaps ch. ii. 10, ἀμέμπτως ἐγενήθημεν, and the breviloquence ch. iii. 13 (where, however, we find ἀμέμπτους), as if it were τηρηθείη εἰς τὸ ἀμέμπτως γενηθῆναι ἐν—. But that is too artificial. Lünemann understands the adverb as more closely defining ὁλόκληρον τηρηθείη; † but *to be perfect without blame* would be a pleonastic description,‡ since *perfection with blame* is something inconceivable. There remains, therefore, only (as recommended also by the order of the words) the reference of the adverb to the verb alone. The τηρηθῆναι, it is true, is the act of God, and so far the adverbial qualification seems to be unsuitable; but since the being kept implies nevertheless a reciprocity between God and man, the prayer is in order: May your spirit, &c. be kept in such a way as can incur no blame at the Coming.§ Ὁλόκληρον, standing foremost, belongs as to sense to all the three members; the construction being, therefore, zeugmatic. The phrase, **spirit, soul, body,** is not a mere rhetorical amplification [De Wette], nor yet of itself a proof of a trichotomy of human nature (Olsh.), borrowed by Paul from Philo (or Plato). The phraseology of Scripture is as exact as it is popular; but it does not favor such a division. Even the texts, Heb. iv. 12; 1 Cor. ii. 14; xv. 44–46, show indeed incontrovertibly, that Scripture distinguishes between the spirit and the soul, but not necessarily as between *constituent parts, substances*, but as between two *relations, sides, functions* of the same essence, according to its upward or downward direction. For πνεῦμα, רוּחַ, is the spiritual nature of man as directed upward, and as capable of living intercourse with God. The power of thought, νοῦς, is not the same thing as πνεῦμα (comp. Rom. vii. and viii.); for the νοῦς can be entangled and enchained in the flesh (Col. ii. 18); the πνεῦμα is the essence quickened, emancipated, become dominant through regeneration by the Spirit of God, and that by means of which man is lord of nature and of the flesh. Of this there is mention here: May your spirit, in which God's spirit dwells and rules (Rom. viii. 16; 1 Cor. ii. 11 with v. 12), be kept safe. It cannot be the Holy Spirit Himself, for He can suffer no hurt, and so needs not to be kept; to beware of grieving Him (Eph. iv.) is something different. But man's spirit is threatened with defilement (2 Cor. vii. 1), whereby the divinely renewed life might again become retrograde, so that at last the ψυχικός should (as it were) no longer have any spirit (Jude 19).—On the contrary, ψυχή, נֶפֶשׁ, is the spiritual nature as the quickening power of the body, as in animals; hence excitable through the senses, with faculties of perception and feeling. Σῶμα, finally, is the wisely arranged instrument of the soul, and destined, therefore, likewise for the service of the Lord (1 Cor. vi. 13 sqq.); whereas σάρξ, which denotes first the bodily material, is further used to designate the whole man, as he with all his powers is enthralled by the sin-tainted corporeality; comp. בָּשָׂר already in Gen. vi. 3.—The Apostle, then, expresses the wish that not merely the spirit may be kept (with reference to what had just preceded) from falling back out of the life of regeneration, but that the soul also in its strivings may be held still under the discipline of the spirit, and thus the body, freed more and more from the dominion of its lusts, become an obedient instrument in the service of sanctification. In this way covetousness, with its violations of brotherly love, will be overcome; believers become one heart and one soul (Acts iv. 32); and fornication will ever more completely lose its power of allurement. This will be a sanctifying of the personality in all its powers and functions.—[For additional remarks on the scriptural usage in regard to πνεῦμα and ψυχή, see the Doctrinal and Ethical Note 5.—Dr. Hodge (on 1 Cor. xv. 43, 44) denies, like our Author (and comp. Ebrard on Heb. iv. 12), a triplicity of substance in the constitution of man. "The Bible," he says, "recognizes in man only two subjects or distinct separable substances, the soul and body. And this has ever been a fundamental principle of Christian anthropology." In like manner Webster and Wilkinson (Wordsworth) find here "a tripartite division rather of man's faculties than of his nature." On the other hand, Dr. Candlish (*Life in a Risen Saviour*, p. 171) remarks on our text: "There, according to a view of man's organization, or the constitution of his nature, these commonly received, spirit, soul, body, are specified as its constituent parts or elements. The spirit, or that higher principle of intelligence and thought peculiar to man alone in this world, to which we now usually restrict the name of mind or soul; the soul, or that lower principle of animal life,—with its instincts selfish and social, its power of voluntary motion, its strange incipient dawn of reasoning,—which, common alike to man and beast, is so great a mystery in both; and the body, made to be the material organ and instrument of either principle, the higher or the lower; these three in one, this trinity, is our present humanity."—Alford: "τὸ πνεῦμα is the **spirit**, the highest and distinctive part of man, the immortal and responsible *soul*, in our common parlance: ἡ ψυχή is the lower or animal soul, containing the passions and desires (αἰτία κινήσεως ζωτικῆς ζώων, Plato, *Deff.* p. 411), which we have in common with the brutes, but which in *us* is ennobled and drawn up by the πνεῦμα. That St. Paul had these distinctions in mind, is plain (against Jowett) from such places as 1 Cor. ii. 14. The spirit, that part whereby we are receptive of the Holy Spirit of God, is, in the unspiritual man, crushed down and subordinated to the animal soul (ψυχή): he therefore is called ψυχικός, πνεῦμα οὐκ ἔχων, Jude

* [Alford (Webster and Wilkinson): "ὁλοτελεῖς seems to refer to the entireness of sanctification, which is presently expressed in detail. . . . = ὅλους." Ellicott: "The aspect of the former word is (here especially) mainly *quantitative*, of the latter, mainly *qualitative*."—J. L.]

† [Ellicott in like manner thus: "The adverbial predication of quality, appended to τηρηθείη, ὁλόκληρον involving that of quantity."—J. L.]

‡ [Such pleonasms, however, are common enough with Paul; comp. especially Eph. i. 4, εἶναι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους.—J. L.]

§ [This, again, restricts the ἀμέμπτως altogether to the human and less important elements in the τηρηθῆναι.—J. L.]

19."—To which may be added part of ELLICOTT's note *in loc.*: "Distinct enunciation of three component parts of the nature of man: the πνεῦμα, the higher of the two immaterial parts, being the '*vis superior, agens, imperans in homine*' (OLSH.); the ψυχή, '*vis inferior quæ agitur, movetur*' (*ib.*), the sphere of the will and the affections, and the true centre of the personality." I should say that, on ELLICOTT's own theory, this distinction belongs rather to the πνεῦμα.—J. L. . . . 'It may be remarked that we frequently find instances of an apparent *dichotomy*, 'body and soul' (Matt. vi. 25, x. 28, al.) or 'body and spirit' (1 Cor. v. 3, vii. 34, al.), but such passages will only be found accommodations to the popular division into a material and immaterial part; the ψυχή, in the former of the exceptional cases, including also the πνεῦμα, just as in the latter case the πνεῦμα also comprehends the ψυχή. . . . To assert that enumerations like the present are rhetorical (DE W.), or worse, that the Apostle probably attached 'no distinct thought to each of these words' (JOWETT), is plainly to set aside all sound rules of scriptural exegesis. Again, to admit the distinctions, but to refer them to Platonism (LÜNEM.), is equally unsatisfactory, and equally calculated to throw doubt on the truth of the teaching. If St. Paul's words do here imply the trichotomy above described . . ., then such a trichotomy is infallibly real and true. And if Plato or Philo have maintained (as appears demonstrable) substantially the same views, then God has permitted a heathen and a Jewish philosopher to advance conjectural opinions which have been since confirmed by the independent teaching of an inspired Apostle."—J. L.]

Faithful is he who calleth you; not disappointing confidence, worthy of credit; THEODORET: ἀληθής. The participle is in the present: He does so continually (ch. ii. 12; Gal. v. 8); or as a substantive: Such is His nature (ch. i. 17 [12]); He ever lets operate the drawing of His Spirit.—**Who also will do it**, the sanctifying and keeping, positively; through grace is not irresistible, yet so that there is no failure on His part. The little word *also* gives prominence to the idea, that the keeping will answer to the calling of the faithful God, as carrying it out even to the end. He perfects His entire work (Ps. xxii. 32 [31]; xxxvii. 5). The Epistle began with thanksgiving to God and His ἐκλογή; it closes with praise of His faithfulness to the end.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. (Vv. 12, 13.) In all churches, however young, πρεσβύτεροι were soon appointed (Acts xv. 23), without whom a church could not exist as such. God is a God of order (1 Cor. xiv. 33); and, without regulated guidance, the πράσσειν τὰ ἴδια must have been neglected, and the περιεργάζεσθαι must have prevailed (1 Thess. iv. 11). In the earliest Epistles, however, the presidents have certainly as yet very little prominence; the προϊστάμενος (Rom. xii. 8) and the κυβερνήσεις (1 Cor. xii. 28) occupying a modest position behind other gifts and functions. Government, command, is not in the Church of Christ the first thing. In this place teaching is not yet attached to superintendency, but stands beside it as a special free gift. Nor even for the exercise of discipline (for example, 1 Cor. v.) is the office at all described as exclusively authorized, and so responsible; and quite as little is obedience to the bishops commended, as in the Ignatian Epistles, as a panacea; rather the Apostle foresees the possibility of corruptions even among the elders (Acts xx. 20). But a due esteem for faithful and laborious presidents is for the welfare of the church. The simple way in which our Epistle speaks of these relations, marks it as one of the earliest. But if at a later date we meet with fuller instructions (Eph. iv. 11, and especially in the Pastoral Epistles), still nowhere are the presidents clothed in the post-apostolic fashion with a character of absolute authority, as if they had an exclusive dignity different from the general priesthood of Christians (1 Pet. ii. 9). Their rule is rather conceived of always as standing in necessary connection with the Holy Spirit ruling in the whole Church (comp. 1 Pet. v. 3); the spiritually minded members of the church must exercise the ministry of office, that it may really appear to be spiritual work, and not merely an acting of hierarchical supremacy, or even of a paid office. Nor does even the abuse of the περιεργάζεσθαι drive the Apostle to a narrow and anxious one-sidedness in putting life into official chains—a proceeding, indeed, to which Moses himself was averse.—As regards the designation of office-bearers, the opinion that has most widely prevailed is, that in the earliest period πρεσβύτερος (elder) and ἐπίσκοπος (overseer) are synonymous; and this is, in fact, favored by such texts as Acts xx. 17, 28; Tit. i. 5, 7. Yet the view of GUNDERT (in RUDELBACH and GUERICKE's *Zeitschrift*, 1854, p. 56, sqq.) is worthy of examination, that in the earliest period πρεσβύτερος was the general title of honor for all church functionaries, who fell apart into 1. ἐπίσκοποι and 2. διάκονοι, the two divisions that meet us Phil. i. 1 and in the Pastoral Epistles; James v. 14 speaks of those who waited on the sick, and calls them πρεσβύτεροι;* on the other hand, Acts xx. and Tit. i. speak only of the higher class of presbyters, the bishops; † whereas 1 Tim. v. 17 distinguishes amongst the elders those who labor in the word and doctrine from others who do not, and yet ch. iii. 2 requires from every ἐπίσκοπος that he be apt to teach. Those κοπιῶντες, therefore, amongst the elders would probably be bishops. If one desired to maintain, even in the passage of the 5th chapter, the identity of bishops and elders generally, he would have to find in κοπιῶντες the description of those who take pains therein; but in that case would the others who proved deficient be nevertheless worthy of double honor? ‡ With the teaching

* [The presbyters whom James speaks of are not represented as in regular attendance on the sick, but as called in on an emergency for the performance of their appropriate ecclesiastical functions; and besides, the article—τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους—shows that the *body of presbyters*, as such, is intended, and not any supposed inferior class.—That the deacons were at any time regarded as presbyters is an utterly arbitrary suggestion, though made by others before Gundert (see MOSHEIM's *Historical Commentaries*, Cent. I. § 37), and is, indeed, at variance with all the indications of the New Testament.—J. L.]

† [But to say that in the Church of Ephesus there existed a plurality of diocesan or monarchical bishops, or that Paul left Titus in Crete to ordain a number of *such* functionaries in every city, would be self-evidently absurd.—J. L.]

‡ [The most natural inference from 1 Tim. v. 17 is, that at the time when that Epistle was written there were elders who ruled, but did not teach, and who, if they ruled well, were to be accounted worthy of double honor; while this honor was especially due to those of the elders, who, whether by a higher official appointment, or by agreement amongst the elders themselves, not only ruled, and ruled well, but labored also in the word and doctrine; just as on the very same principle it might be said, that double honor was still more emphatically due to such elders of the

bishop, and under his direction, there might be developed the richest abundance of spiritual gifts, which were not confined to office (1 Cor. xiv. 26–32) The mode of election, finally, is not yet constitutionally regulated. Roos: There was at that time no disputing about the right of patronage.—If the Apostle requires that a bishop must have a good report even of them which are without (1 Tim. iii. 7), so much the less, certainly, would presidents have been forced on a church, in whom it had no confidence. The Apostles could allow the churches large scope, for they could trust them, that they yielded themselves to the guidance of Christ's Spirit. But where this prerequisite should not exist, to think of helping the Church by committing to the congregations comprehensive rights of government—this were a proceeding for which there could, at least, be no appeal to the Apostles. It is certain that the Apostles would have laid hands on no one of whom they had known: He stands not in our doctrine, which we have received from the Lord (comp. Acts ii. 42; 1 Tim. v. 22).

2. (Vv. 13–15.) Respect for the presidents is connected with the peace of the church; and, on the other hand, peace relieves for them the burden of office. Peaceableness, however, must not be a corrupt allowance of all disorder. A true keeping of the peace does not exclude, but includes, discipline. It is a morbid symptom of our time, that it can so little endure discipline. It is true that to administer it in a proper way is a delicate matter, requiring both inwardly and outwardly much wisdom, love, patience, and self-denial. But it is none the less a false lenity and a criminal selfishness, listlessly to allow others, who are intrusted to us, to go to ruin. If a man is willing, not merely to deliver lordly admonitions to others, but to begin with the beam in his own eye, and also not to sin against his brother by neglecting to admonish him (Lev. xix. 17; Ezek. iii. 17 sqq.), but to warn him at whatever risk of suffering for it, he can in this way maintain peace even amidst the assaults of enemies.

3. (Vv. 16–18.) The gospel produces no joyless sullenness, but true joy for all people (Luke ii. 10), in hope (Rom. xii. 12), in the Holy Ghost (Rom. xiv. 17), in the Lord (Phil. iv. 1 [4]). When vexed with temptations, we cannot, indeed, *feel* it as joy, but we should so *account* it (James i. 2). Whatever occasion of sadness is contained in affliction (ch. i.–iii.), it nevertheless promotes our salvation; and the man who not merely seeks, but *has* the Lord, in him is the fulness of joy (John xv. 11; xvi. 24; xvii. 13). Prayer is the means to this end. From fear of mechanism in prayer, some would regard merely its free spirit. But the likely result of that is a yielding to hindrances. We are not so free from corruption, that we should be able to leave the matter to our inclination. Practice, when attended to not as a legal penalty, but in hearty fidelity, awakens the right disposition; only in this way can one *καιρός* assist another, so that the intervening *χρόνος* shall be filled with the spirit of prayer, and prayer become the keynote of the soul. PELAG.: *Si jugiter non potes lingua, tamen corde.* Who acts thus? who not? why not? Comp. Luke xviii. 1; Rom. xii. 12; Eph. vi. 18. If, for the quickening of devotion, the Apostle counsels us to give thanks, it is but the other side of the same truth, when the counsel of an experienced Christian was: Still repent! for that only is true thanksgiving, which confesses: Of Thy favor I am not worthy; and that only true repentance, which utters itself in thanksgiving, that God is nevertheless our God.

4. (Vv. 19–22.) It is a real trial of the spirit, the way in which a man treats the manifestations of spiritual gifts, and also their excesses. How easily do we fall either into a temper of undue excitement, whereby the limits of propriety and discretion are broken through, or, in opposition to this, into an uneasy or haughty, cold distrust of everything unusual! In movements of the stronger sort there is, indeed, an element of discomfort, disturbance, offence; they contain a presumption of abandoning the common track, and the danger is imminent, that with confused or even impure minds every path of order may be despised, and that what began in the Spirit may find its sad end in the flesh. By word and example the Apostle shows us, that we are neither blindly to assent to everything, nor suspiciously to reject everything. *Quench not the Spirit.* What is really spirit, should develop itself in a free and living way. The only thing required is, that it stand the proof that it is really spirit from the Spirit of God. In that case, though it may be strange and troublesome to the world, a spiritual man confesses it. It is owing to the narrowness of our hearts, that we are so annoyed by whatever is not according to our way. On the other hand, there may be a large-heartedness that neglects to try whether something is of Divine quality, and that perhaps just while a false appeal is made to the apostolic word: *Prove all things.* On this point RIEGER has already remarked, that that has come to be a huntsman's halloo, as if in every heap of rubbish we must look for pearls. When, for example, one asks us to inquire whether there is not more truth in the Chinese religion than in the Christian, that has nothing at all to do with the word of the Apostle. According to this, as according to that of John (1 John iv. 1), the question is, to try the spirits, whether they are of God. But there are spirits which are not so; false prophets (2 Thess. ii.); deceivers or deceived; nay, with an honest intention erroneous human inferences may be drawn from what the Spirit saith (comp. Acts xxi. 4, 11–14). There is really nowhere a formula, in which a man can comfortably rest. The matter must therefore be tried; but how? The great thing is to try by the right test, and not mere cavils and idle talk. Even in the things of this world it is folly to criticise aught without knowledge; much more, then, in Divine things. There we must be sure that we actually have the Divine rule. Even entrance into the faith does not take place blindly and without proof (John vii. 17); the knowledge, that the gospel is what our deepest necessity requires, admits of systematic development as a branch of apologetic science. But here Paul speaks of a trial, where a standing within the evangelical faith is already presupposed, and the question now is, whether this or that novelty is in accordance therewith. On what assurance of the truth the Apostle himself proceeds is shown by Gal. i. 8. A trial, therefore, in the Apostle's sense proceeds on the certainty of the fundamental apostolic truth. Even DE WETTE does not claim, that the rationalistic first principle, as to natural reason being the judge of Divine revelation, is to be derived from

Church Catholic, as discharged also apostolic functions (1 Pet. v. 1). The other text, 1 Tim. iii. 2, when taken in connection with all the texts which demonstrate the identity of the bishop and presbyter, can prove nothing more than that at this period the former title was confined to the teaching presbyters.—J. L.]

our passage. For, 1. he says that the object of the trial is not revelation itself, but its reproduction, application, appropriation by those Christianly inspired; and, 2. that the rule is not to be the rationalistic reason (that unknown x), but the Christian πνεῦμα; a legitimate trial requiring faith as a prerequisite. But then DE WETTE himself again in some measure introduces rationalism, when he says, 1. that in Scripture we have simply the apostolic reproduction of the original revelation (as if the latter were not thus reduced to an x!), and, 2. that man carries in himself the germ of the πνεῦμα, the reason, which, indeed, is first unbound and unfolded through Christ; Christians, consequently, would have to test by means of the Christian consciousness awakened in them, with the Christianly enlightened reason. But Christian consciousness is too weak an expression for the πνεῦμα according to the sense of Scripture. For this supposes, not merely illumination, but *regeneration*, and so a real, practical process of sanctification in submission to the word. At all events, we attain to the πνεῦμα in quite another way than that of criticism. Whoever has received it, bears in himself the witness that the Spirit is truth, and that this spiritual life is attained in no other way than from this source. Comp. GESS, *Das Zeugniss des Heil. Geistes* in the *Apologetische Beiträge* of GESS and RIGGENBACH, Basel, 1863. Hence follows the right treatment of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit in different directions. The prophetic element, awakenings amongst the people, and such like, should not, alongside of the regular ministry, be despised, or suppressed, but tested, and held to a steady sobriety. And so, on the other hand, with regard to the gift of γνῶσις, a profounder scientific research and knowledge, against which there easily arises in excited circles a spirit of contempt and distrust. The gospel, however, is no dead letter, but itself invites to ever-new labor of thought. Nor is the right of examination limited to teachers, or even to a council of bishops. According to 1 Cor. xii. 10 the διάκρισις πνευμάτων is a peculiar charism, a kind of receptive prophesying, incapable, therefore, of producing, but of inestimable value as a sound counterpoise to possible irregularities; a mark of the ὁλοκληρία of an apostolic church. This gift must show itself by its connection with the truth of God; only one in whom God's word is a living, sanctifying power gives evidence of the ability to test; and it is then a spiritual labor of no slight character, nor to be reached through external regulation. To train the laity to a Christian self-dependence is the aim of a truly evangelical ministry. Where that gift is present, there is possible a wise, confident treatment of intellectual and spiritual movements; people then stop saying to one another what the Würtemberg superintendent WEBER heard from the peasant MICHAEL HAHN: "How comes it that our parsons are always preaching that men ought to be converted, and, when one is converted, they cannot bear it?" to which, after being silent for some time, he replied, "God knows he is right!" None the less mindful, however, are we still of the truth, that it is not everything claiming to be Divine that is so; as the lady VON KRÜDENER confessed on her deathbed: "Often have I taken for the voice of God what was nothing but the fruit of my fancy and my pride." Yet she was able to add: "What good I have done will remain; what evil I have done, God's mercy will blot out."

5. (Vv. 23, 24.) *Peace* is here properly to be taken in its fulness of meaning, Hebr. שָׁלוֹם, life unimpaired (comp. ὁλόκληρος, שָׁלֵם), the full feeling of life in the strength of the atonement. With this agrees also the opposite, *confusion* (1 Cor. xiv. 33). This peace alone makes joy possible even in suffering, and thanksgiving even in distress and affliction. But God alone brings us to the enjoyment of a true peace, not only with one another (v. 13), but first in and with Himself. This comes to pass through an all-pervading sanctification. *Spirit and soul*—the two designations may be used indifferently, when the question is not about diversity of functions, but solely about the one and the same substance; thus ψυχή stands with σῶμα, Matt. x. 28; and again πνεῦμα with σῶμα, 1 Cor. vii. 34 (whereas here the point is, not simply the preservation of life, but sanctification and the service of God); πνεῦμα with σάρξ (1 Pet. iii. 18, 19; 2 Cor. vii. 1) denotes the two ruling principles. But where the exact testing and sifting of the motives of action are spoken of, whether they proceed from above or from beneath, there it is said that the word of God, as a two-edged sword, pierces to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit (Heb. iv. 12). And so here the discourse regards the sanctifying and keeping of all man's functions. For the spirit cannot truly serve God, if soul and body continue in their natural state of estrangement from the life that is of God, but they too must (slowly, gradually, with conflict and trial, with daily mortifying of the σάρξ, and yet with carefulness for the σῶμα) be drawn into the sanctifying process, and that must be inwrought into them. Otherwise our reason apologizes for sin; it savoreth not the things that be of God, but those that be of men; the conscience is lulled to sleep; the emotions and feelings of the soul sway up and down; the body is allowed to go unchecked in its wants and impulses. The whole must be changed. Very well VON GERLACH: The spirit of man is sanctified and kept, when God's Spirit dwells in it and rules it; the soul is sanctified, when the Divinely sanctified spirit controls it, when all its feelings, all its longings and strivings, however necessary to the maintenance in man of his proper life, and to the exertion thereby of an influence also on the world around, are yet perfectly subordinated to God and the spirit. The body is sanctified, when its instincts and wants are ruled and regulated by the spirit through the soul, and its members are made altogether instruments of holiness. It might seem as if in the sanctification of the spirit the sanctification of the soul and the body were already included. But it is of importance that the latter also is mentioned here and frequently, to guard us against the dangerous error, that possibly the spirit might serve God, whilst the soul and the body persist in serving sin.—The Apostle here, as throughout the entire Epistle (ch. i. 10; ii. 19; iii. 13; iv. 15), directs our view toward the coming of the Lord. Then only will the true judgment be held, as never once before the private conscience (1 Cor. iv. 3–5).

No peace, therefore, with sin! In order to our standing in that judgment, we need to place our reliance not on ourselves, but solely on the faithfulness of God. Having begun His work in us, He will also perfect it (Phil. i. 6; 1 Cor. i. 9; x. 13; 1 Pet. i. 5). Human exhortations and resolutions, necessary as they are, and though an emanation from God's faithfulness, an instrument in His hand, an occasion of growth in a varied experience, yet do not carry

within themselves the guarantee of success. Only that which the grace of God supplies is a pledge of the greater gift: He will not forsake His own work. This alone secures for us the possibility of reaching perfection. Am I already holy? perfectly holy? who would dare to make such an assertion, in presence of Phil. iii. 12; James iii. 2; 1 John i. 8–10? and still we are not at liberty to indulge ourselves in a comfortable repose. Certainly the last text shows us, how little 1 John iii. 9 is to be explained in the sense of a frightfully erroneous perfectionism. Even the maturest Christians, when dying, draw their comfort from the thought, not how holy they are, but that they are in Christ. The holiness of the Saviour covers their sins and imperfections. But this new garment consumes the old man. Faith, which, apprehended by Christ, apprehends Christ [Phil. iii. 12], is no idle amusement of vain hopes, but a going forth out of ourselves, and a casting of ourselves with all our powers on Christ. To be kept in Christ with spirit, soul, and body, that is to be kept indeed. The man who stands there is not yet, it is true, perfectly holy, but that is the point, nevertheless, toward which he will strive heartily. Such is the evangelical doctrine of perfection. On the certainty of salvation, comp. the *Apolog. Beiträge* of GESS and RIGGENBACH, pp. 230–233.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vv. 12, 13. HEUBNER: Paul beseeches. A sentiment of cordial esteem and gratitude is something so tender, that it does not at all admit of the coercion of a command; especially esteem for our teachers.—*Berlenburger Bibel:* What the Holy Spirit might command, for that He beseeches and implores.—*The same:* Know them; that it may not be said: They knew nothing of Joseph.—*Who labor amongst* (or *on*) *you;* ZWINGLI: *Non enim est otiandum, non stertendum. Et labor arduus est, prædicare verbum Dei.*—CALVIN: From the number of masters must be excluded all slow bellies [Tit. i. 12].—*Berlenburger Bibel:* Teachers are not called to laziness, nor yet to an animal (mere outward bodily) activity. Spiritual labor is the soul's earnest painstaking, wrestling, and searching, not only for one's self, but for others; a laboring in prayer and patience (comp. 2 Cor. xi.; also Col. i. 29; ii. 1; Gal. iv. 19).—HEUBNER: Teachers desire to make something of men; this labor is a great thing; but it is not always recognized as such.—To choose laboring for souls as one's exclusive calling is a service that requires effort, and in which at the same time the heart of faithful labor shuns admeasurement.—CALVIN: It is not in vain that these marks are noted; by them believers are to distinguish the true pastors.—CHRYSOSTOM has already very unapostolic effusions on ill-will towards the priests, through whom alone we receive admission to the kingdom of heaven and its *tremendis mysteriis.*—HEUBNER: To misapprehend those who wish us well, and to frustrate their labor, brings us sensible damage.—*Berl. Bib.:* The labor divided into presiding and exhorting.—If thou observest defects in the presidents, do not withdraw from them thy loving intercession.—To preside is not to domineer (1 Pet. v. 3; 2 Cor. i. 24).—*The same:* To preside is to lead the way, not haughtily to tyrannize.—A legitimate presidency is exercised in the Lord, therefore not in one's own name. It is subject to the trial of spirits. But the presidents are not merely the mouths by which the church speaks; they serve the church as belonging to Christ; they serve Christ in it.—Admonition is not the pleasantest duty, but the severest.—*The same:* Presidents must learn to have zeal with knowledge, to correct with wisdom, to rebuke in love.—*The same:* Exhortation includes all Divine methods of admonition, encouragement, excitation. It is the particular application of the word to this and that person; not merely publicly, but in private.

HEUBNER: The love of an honest teacher has no price; only warm love is its worthy reward.

DIEDRICH: Quarrels and divisions easily occur, when the preacher's office is not honored.—On the other hand, where there is a tendency to strife, there the warnings of the presidents are disregarded.—[VAUGHAN: Subordination is peace.—J. L.]

[M. HENRY: Ministers should rather mind the *work* and duty they are called *to*, than affect venerable and honorable *names* they may be called *by.*—J. L.]

[*Lectures:* Christian liberty not an anarchy.—All Church organization finds its warrant, vitality, and blessing in Christ. The whole relation of pastor and people grows out of their joint relation to Him.—THIERSCH: The Church, although composed of members who are all called to be filled with the Holy Ghost, has yet been from the beginning not mere Spirit, but the very Body of Christ, in which every part has that place and duty which have been assigned to it by God, and no other. The Church is the most perfect of all organizations, and Christianity the completion of all ordinances.—J. L.]

V. 14. HEUBNER: It is the duty of all to further the teacher's work, and to take part in his cares.—RIEGER: There is nothing more unhandsome, than when one will be everything, and is afraid of missing aught through the co-operation of others; whatever God grants to another to perform, that we ought to enjoy as really a common good.—ZWINGLI: It is the duty of all to exhort one another, and so much the less to be displeased, when others perform it.—By no means should we leave exhortation to teachers, and ourselves maintain a sluggish peace. It is not to maintain peace, when no one dares to say aught, and no one allows aught to be said to him. True peace exists only where the truth sanctifies all.—Every one is known by his neighbors better than by his minister, from whom much is concealed.

CALVIN: *Remedia morbis sunt accommodanda.*—HEUBNER: It is truly a Christ-like work [*ein wahres Jesuswerk*], to interest one's self in souls for which others regard labor as lost. Rude persons, who will submit to no order, need earnest correction, reproofs, challenges; faint-hearted ones, the class opposite to the rude, despondent, never satisfied with themselves, need comfort; the weak, failing often, doing their part imperfectly, need help and support; every man needs patience, because every man has something about him that others find troublesome and repugnant.—The sooner exhortation is given, the easier it goes.—To comfort may prove wearisome, especially when what is desired is not the evangelical comfort, to be still under the hand of God.—CALVIN: When with one or two attempts at consolation we do not reach our end, we easily become annoyed.—*Berl. Bib.:* We must not take on airs with the lowly, but put ourselves on their level.—Those weak in understanding, faith, love, inclination to holiness, we must so much the less abandon to themselves.—Patience is not indifference, for it endures what it

recognizes as evil; therefore is it a grace, to be able to be patient (1 Pet. ii. 19).* Impatience is weakness.—STARKE: This Divine disposition (to be slow to wrath) we too should have in ourselves; as a fruit of the Spirit (Gal. v. 22).—Every Christian has yet his faults; what is there in me that others have to bear (Eph. iv. 32)? Let us therefore exercise patience towards the members of our family, and not merely towards strangers; towards those in a humble position, and not merely towards the eminent.

V. 15. HEUBNER: It is the duty of Christians to maintain the spirit of love in the Church, and destroy all seeds of bitterness.—Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, is a principle of Divine justice; but selfishness would execute it in an arbitrary style.—STARKE: To requite good with evil is devilish; to requite evil with evil is heathenish; to requite good with good is commendable; to requite evil with good is Christian.—CHRYSOSTOM: What harm can be done to the man, who is able even to requite evil with good? Whereas the bee, along with its sting, parts with its life.—Abigail knew how to warn David. Zinzendorf said, that his chief aim was to love those who injured him.

Vv. 12–15. STOCKMEYER: The Apostle is concerned about two things, that there be mutual exhortation, and that peace be maintained. Both are important; both must go hand in hand. Neither should be a hindrance in the way of the other. The one can prosper only when the other does; and the welfare of the Church, only when both are duly regarded.

V. 16. HEUBNER: The Christian is always under the cross, and always in joy. Christianity the way to true gladness. But the gladness of a Christian is inward, deep, silent. And the path to this gladness lies only through sorrow. *Res severa verum gaudium.*—There is much sorrow in the world; but it is only true mourning that is blessed (Matt. v. 4). The work of God's grace is the most glorious that can gladden the heart of man. Joy likewise belongs to the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. v. 22).—RIEGER: We may even be assailed by a variety of fortune; only the foundation of hope, as the proper source of Christian joyousness, should under all changes remain the same.—*Berl. Bib.:* Many suppose that there is not in the world a more wretched, unhappy man than a true Christian; in this way the devil disheartens people.—But prayerful joy alone is true joy.—[BARROW's Sermon on this text opens thus: "*Rejoice evermore!* O good Apostle, how acceptable rules dost thou prescribe! O gracious God, how gracious laws dost Thou impose!"—See also a Sermon by Dr. DONNE, and four by Dr. GALE.—J. L.]

V. 17. ZWINGLI: True prayer is the lifting of the heart to God, not empty, wordy babble.—LUTHER, in STARKE: The whole life of a genuine Christian goes on continually in prayer. For, though he is not constantly moving his lips or multiplying words, yet the heart, like the artery and heart in the body, goes on beating unceasingly with sighs, and the more that blows, vexation, and distress become severely afflictive and urgent, with so much the greater force does this sighing and praying proceed, even orally, so that you can as little find a Christian without prayer as a living man without a pulse, which stands never still, though the man is sleeping or doing something else, and he is not aware of it.—RIEGER: To pray without growing weary, without yielding to hindrances, without despairing of the salvation of God, is to pray without ceasing. All sayings of Scripture must be reduced to practice also in that Spirit by whom they were uttered; under whose auspices we never take aim too high, nor is any indulgence given to the sluggishness of the flesh.—When you do not at once receive the thing prayed for, do not therefore give over; hold on (Rom. xii. 12).—*Berl. Bib.:* Four great hindrances to prayer: 1. too much outward business uncommanded by God; 2. too little subduing of the body; 3. too little privacy; 4. too great slothfulness.—*The same:* If thou wouldst not cease to pray, cease not to desire. The fervor of love is the cry of the heart. [AUGUSTINE, as quoted by WORDSWORTH: Continuous desire is continuous prayer. If you cease to desire, you are dumb, you have ceased to pray.—J. L.]—KÜNDIG (in the *Erfahrungen am Kranken- und Sterbebette*, p. 218) does not allow the validity of the complaint: *I cannot pray;* as you have complained thus to me, a man, you can just as certainly sigh to God, and say: *Alas, O God, I can no longer pray!* and so you are already engaged in prayer.—[See two Sermons by BARROW on this verse.—J. L.]

V. 18. That man is very unthankful to God, to whom the righteousness of Christ and the hope of eternal life are not of so much consequence, that he can rejoice in the midst of sorrow. Thanksgiving is a bridle on our desires. We are indeed permitted to pray earnestly, yet so that God's will be dearer to us than our own.—RIEGER: One finds always occasion for thanksgiving, when we learn to understand how even that which seems adverse is thus well arranged for the quelling of the flesh and its disposition, and for the relief of the Spirit.—*Berl. Bib.:* The best thanksgiving is expressed in obedience, so that we again present to Him all that we have received from Him.—CHRYSOSTOM: Hast thou suffered some evil thing? Why, if thou dost so choose, there is nothing evil in it. Give God thanks, and then it is changed into a blessing. With CHRYSOSTOM it was an axiom: *There is but one calamity, sin.* And after many sorrows he died with the words: *God be praised for everything!* [δόξα τῷ Θεῷ πάντων ἕνεκεν.]—To the thankful there is ever imparted an increase of blessing, Ps. l. 23.* [A beautiful hymn on this verse by Mrs. META HEUSSER, see in SCHAFF's *German Hymn-Book*, Philad. 1859, No. 30.]

Vv. 16–18. STOCKMEYER: In what way may we attain to the ability of complying with the summons to be always joyful? The will of God is first of all, that thou too shouldst be in Christ. Then hast thou God for thy Father; then is thy whole life in God and with God, with a heart that ever prays, that is, is ever directed toward God. Then art thou joyful in God (Ps. lxxiii. 25 sqq.), though not always triumphing aloud. When in the very depths of the soul is a still unreconciled conscience, no man can be truly glad; but let the peace of God dwell in the heart's depths, and it is possible for thee, as a child of God, to weep as if thou wept not—to be sorrowful, and yet always rejoicing. 2. But how shall we attain to this sure and constant communion through Christ with God? There are very many interruptions to the course of our prayers; pleasure and sor-

* [Τοῦτο γὰρ χάρις, κ.τ.λ.—J. L.]

* [According to LUTHER's version: "*Wer Dank opfert, der preiset mich; und da ist der Weg, dass ich ihm zeige das Heil Gottes.*"—J. L.]

row find us often unprepared. Now even that must incite us to prayer, and also to thanksgiving. If still unable to give thanks *for* everything, we may nevertheless *in* all things, at least for the earlier blessings already received; not as if all that was to go for nothing; till we learn also to give thanks even for chastisement itself. But especially is that, which God in Christ has done in thee, worthy of the loftiest praise. To be still uncertain as to our gracious state is a heart-trouble, sorer than all suffering. Whereas to have found mercy makes temporal afflictions light. We perceive also how little salutary would be a time of undisturbed prosperity, in which the heart would become corrupted and ever more greedy. Not till sin and infirmity lie wholly behind us, will our whole life be everlasting devotion and unspeakable joy.—Comp. PAUL GERHARDT's Hymn, *Nicht so traurig, nicht so sehr*, &c.

V. 19. STÄHELIN: The Holy Spirit in His gracious workings is quenched by the pious against their will through carelessness, so that the light of joy and strength declines in them, and they have to rekindle it with ardent sighs; but the ungodly suppress the Holy Spirit's knocking by wanton resistance.—*Berl. Bib.:* Check the power of the Spirit neither in yourselves nor in others. By dissipation amongst vanities we quench the Spirit in ourselves. We should always resist ourselves rather than others.—RIEGER: In things of the Spirit we do not exercise as much reasonableness as in the affairs of civil life, where we know how to turn to use the gifts and intelligence of every citizen; whilst in spiritual things, on account of the apprehended abuse, we attempt an utter extinction.—VON GERLACH: One main cause of the decay of our Church is, that the activity of the laity, the manifestation of the gifts vouchsafed to them for the common advantage, has no regular sphere of operation (comp. 1 Cor. xiv.).—There the life is contracted and withered.

V. 20. HEUBNER: Prophesyings are, strictly speaking, considered by the Christian; he is not a sceptic, nor an unbeliever, but neither is he credulous.—Prophets appear even along with the written word; only not *in opposition* to it; they are rather those *in* whom the word becomes living, and through them also for others. The Reformers were the prophets of their century; SPENER one of those of the century that followed. Nor was there wanting to them also the stamp of the hatred which they had to endure (Matt. v. 11, 12).—*Berl. Bib.:* We should duly regard the manner in which God works wondrously even in novices, and give the glory to Him alone.

[On vv. 16-20 Bishop BEVERIDGE has Brief Notes, and a Sermon on v. 18.—J. L.]

V. 21. ZWINGLI: *Prove all things;* that holds good of things that are still doubtful, and respecting which the judgment is still unsettled.—*Berl. Bib.:* It is one thing, to prove; another, to destroy. For the trial there is needed the Spirit of God, and a humble mind, that will bend and bow.—Whatever novelty presents itself is to be proved by the already authenticated gospel. We are required to discern, not only ungodly spirits, but likewise human admixtures with the truth. We are to allow *ourselves* to be proved by the Spirit of God (Ps. cxxxix.). Human reason judges differently in different individuals, so long as we are unenlightened (1 Cor. ii. 14); the Apostle's exhortation is directed to such as stood in the faith.

[BENSON: What a glorious freedom of thought do the Apostles recommend! And how contemptible in their view is a blind and implicit faith!—WATERLAND's Sermon on this verse: I. Care and discretion in *choosing;* II. Firmness and steadiness in *retaining.*—J. L.]

V. 22. *Verum index sui et falsi.*—HEIDELBERG CATECHISM, *Quest.* 114: (We should) with earnest purpose begin to live, not only according to some, but all, the commandments of God.—STOCKMEYER: Shun evil of every kind, even when there is no intention of evil; when it is not a lie, but an error; even when it is found in an otherwise well-enlightened, respectable, beloved person; even when it is proposed in connection with what is true and good; even when it has much that is plausible and attractive. Whatever conflicts with the word of God is of evil, let it seem never so obvious.

V. 23. Without peace no sanctification [CHARNOCK: God is first the God of peace, before He be the God of sanctification.—J. L.], without sanctification no peace.—RIEGER: Man can indeed do nothing without God; but God also will do nothing without man, and the proof of his obedience at every step.—STARKE: Blessed the man, to whom God is a God of peace in Christ, and not a God of vengeance out of Christ.*—The God of peace has thoughts of peace toward us.—RIEGER: Peace with God is first of all the atonement, effected on the cross by the blood of Jesus, and received by us in faith. But here the idea is still broader, and embraces likewise everything whereby God holds us in subjection to Himself, so that all striving and cavilling against God ceases, and on the contrary everything in man submits itself contentedly under God, passes under the easy yoke of Christ, is kept by a cheerful and willing spirit to a joyful life according to the will of God, and so peace with God and in God rules in the heart. This God of peace, drawing us thus entirely to Himself, by the very same means sanctifies us. For truly our sanctification is the willing and contented surrender to God, to His will and service, and cleaving to Him forever.—This requires on our side pursuit and effort, but in the strength which God furnishes (Phil. ii. 12 sq.). Therefore, no peace with sin, not even with any favorite sin; entire sanctification is the aim.—*Berl. Bib.:* By the fall we are wholly corrupted; the sanctifying process would take possession of us wholly. Presently we are afraid that we may become too holy.—[Bishop WILSON: *spirit, soul, body.* All these have been defiled, and all must be regenerated.—J. L.]

V. 24. BENGEL: In this brief word is contained the sum of all consolation.—*Berl. Bib.:* We must not rest in the best of rules, but betake ourselves to God Himself. Otherwise an idolatry grows out of the rules.

[VAUGHAN: God not only speaks, but will do. With Him words are never disjoined from deeds, nor promises from their performance.—J. L.]

Vv. 23, 24. STOCKMEYER: From the Apostle's benediction, as earnest as it is comforting, we may see that the question concerns a thorough sanctification; 1. What is it? Not a superficial transformation here and there, but a renovation of our entire nature; 2. Why is it so highly necessary? Because that will be the subject of inquiry and judgment on

* [It is a still more serious thought, that as the God of vengeance, no less than as the God of peace, God is in Christ; John v. 22; Acts xvii. 31; Rev. xix. 11-21; &c.—J. L.]

the day of judgment and decision of our eternal destiny; 3. How is it possible? Not in our own strength; nor are we referred to ourselves, where we should find only weakness and corruption, but to the steadfast, gracious will, and the thoughts of peace, of Almighty God.—[Irenæus, in Wordsworth: What reason had the Apostle to pray for a perfect preservation of those elements (soul, body, and spirit), unless he knew the reunion of all three, and that there is one salvation for them all? They will be perfect, who present all three blameless to God.—J. L.]

V.

Conclusion of the Epistle with Salutation and Benediction.

Ch. V. 25–28.

25, 26, 27 Brethren, pray for us. Greet all the brethren with a holy kiss. I
charge [adjure][1] you by the Lord, that this [the, τήν] epistle be read unto all
28 the holy[2] brethren. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ *be* with you. Amen.[3]

[1] V. 27.—A. B. D.[1] E. ἐνορκίζω [found nowhere else]; Sin. and most others, ὁρκίζω, which is, indeed, more common in the New Testament [Mark v. 7; Acts xix. 13;—the only other instances], and therefore, perhaps, in the present instance merely a correction. [Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott edit ἐνορκ.—Nearly all versions and commentaries give the full force of the Greek verb, as E. V. does in the other instances, and here in the margin.—J. L.]

[2] V. 27.—ἁγίοις is wanting in B. D. E. F. G. and in Sin. *primâ manu;* but is found in A. K. L., Sin. *secundâ manu*, and in most of the versions. De Wette is probably right in holding, that it was omitted as being unusual and apparently superfluous, rather than it was added; it is found also at Heb. iii. 1. [It is omitted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford. Riggenbach brackets it in his version.—J. L.]

[3] V. 28.—ἀμήν at the close is wanting in B. D.[1] F. G.; most of the authorities have it, and so Sin. [The critical editors generally omit it; Riggenbach brackets.—J. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. (V. 25.) **Brethren, pray for us** (καὶ περί, B. D.[1], is unsuitable [Lachmann inserts the καί in brackets.—J. L.]). The closing words are concise and hearty. First, he solicits intercession in behalf of his apostolic calling; this he frequently does, laying stress upon it, and humbly suing for it (2 Thess. iii. 1; Rom. xv. 30; Col. iv. 3; Eph. vi. 18, 19; Phile. 22).* Bengel notes that in the Epistle to the Galatians and in the First to the Corinthians he does not do so, because he was there compelled to admonish his readers with fatherly severity.†

2. (V. 26.) **Greet all the brethren with a holy kiss**; φίλημα, a love-token (Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12); φίλημα ἀγάπης (1 Pet. v. 14); in the Latin Fathers, and first Tertullian, *osculum pacis* [*signaculum pacis.*—J. L.], also simply *pax*. The kiss, a general mark of salutation, especially in the East, was here to be hallowed as an expression of brotherly love, and of the common joy in the Lord. It had its place especially after prayer, and before taking the Holy Supper, &c. According to Tertullian it was omitted on Good Friday (on account of the kiss of Judas). Later ecclesiastical rules (with a view particularly to cutting off every pretext for heathen calumnies) insisted that only men should kiss men, and women women. The custom remained till the middle ages, and it still prevails in the East at Easter (comp. Augusti, *Handbuch der chr. Archäol.*, II. p. 718 sqq.). Because in the other Pauline passages it is said: ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους, but here: τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς πάντας, De Wette and Lünemann infer that the Epistle, received and read in public by the presidents, requires them, first of all, to salute and kiss all the brethren in the Apostle's name. Ewald even asserts that vv. 25–27, beginning so abruptly, were plainly added by Paul in his own hand for the authentication of the letter, according to 2 Thess. iii. 17 (in pursuance of the untenable hypothesis, that our First Epistle was rather the Second); and that these words, accordingly, were intended first for the presidents; Timothy having probably informed him that our Second Epistle (which was rather the First) had not been duly read in public before the assembled church. But even the appeal to 3 John 9 has no power to lift all this out of the category of utterly groundless hypotheses. In opposition to it Hofmann properly reminds us, that the invitation in v. 25 is addressed to *all* the Thessalonians, and therefore also the next v. 26; hence: *Deliver my salutation* (*in connection with the holy kiss*) *to all the brethren*—this the Thessalonians did collectively, when on hearing these words they kissed one another.

3. (V. 27.) **I adjure you**, &c.; ὁρκίζω or ἐνορκίζω has also a different construction from the present, but here it is construed with two accusatives, one of the human person addressed, and another of the Divine Person *by* whom the adjuration takes place (comp. Acts xix. 13); τὸν κύριον affording an indirect proof of the divinity of Christ [Deut. vi. 13; Is. lxv. 16; Matt. xxvi. 63.—J. L.]. What follows might mean: that the Epistle be read *by* all (dative after the passive); but better: that it be read *to* (*before*) all, including also those who could not read; also before women and children; *omnibus auscultantibus* (Bengel). Not: acknowledged as *genuine;* which is against the usage, and equally at variance with the state of the case, the Second Epistle having first to speak of spurious Epistles. *Before all the brethren*, to wit, in Thessalonica; not abroad in Macedonia generally (Bengel [Wordsworth]), for that must have been expressed. But why this

* [Comp. 2 Cor. i. 11; Phil. i. 19; Heb. xiii. 18.—J. L.]

† [Bengel also remarks that this request is wanting likewise in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, either because Paul addressed them as his sons, or because he could already count on having their intercession.—J. L.]

urgent, solemn adjuration? For in the supposition, that we need not take the strong expression so strictly [JOWETT], we dare just as little acquiesce in this instance as at 1 Cor. viii. 13 and Rom. ix. 3. Everywhere the Apostle has his good reason for speaking so. Already THEODORET and then OLSHAUSEN conjecture that there was a slight feeling of distrust that the presidents might not read the Epistle to all; CALVIN and VON GERLACH suppose either that malevolent, envious persons might suppress the letter, or that a false prudence and caution might communicate it only to a few. The latter idea is more conceivable than the former. But without clearer evidence it is scarcely right for us to take up a reproach against the presidents. The incidental disturbances at Thessalonica really proceeded from the ἀτάκτοις, and the most that was to be apprehended was, that all (presidents or others) might not have exactly the right tact in dealing with them. It is not said: τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ (comp. Col. iv. 16), but emphatically: *to all the brethren;* DE WETTE: as much as to say, that no one should miss the reading. There is no foundation for BAUR'S statement (*Paulus*, p. 491), that the view of a later period betrays itself, according to which the apostolic letters had the authority of sacred things, to which due reverence was to be shown by a repeated reading in public, and that Paul himself could never have found it necessary solemnly to adjure the churches, that they should not leave his letters unread. But that he does not do at all; only that the Epistle shall not be withheld from *any one*, for this he makes them answerable before God; and as to a repeated reading for the sake of showing honor (a strange idea in itself), there is again no mention of it, as the very aorist infinitive shows (LÜNEMANN).*—But why, then, this urgent exhortation? There is no second instance of it, and to us, with our inexact knowledge of the circumstances, it is not perfectly intelligible. But, remembering how greatly he longed to see the Thessalonians (ch. iii.), we understand thus much, that he considers it of high importance that his written exhortations should come straight to all, and have their influence on all, in order that no false reports may arise from a false reserve; also that no one may be allowed on any pretence to avoid hearing them, and that generally all discrepancies may be at once crushed in the bud. HOFMANN refers to the circumstance, that the Thessalonians, who yearned so earnestly for Paul's personal return, might be tempted somewhat to undervalue the written substitute for that; and this he guards against.†—This passage by no means implies the existence of a series of apostolic letters; on the contrary, we rather get the impression that writing to churches was still a new business for him, and hence his exceeding anxiety that the Epistle should act on all. This First Epistle he recommends to be read, as Moses and the Prophets were read (Deut. xxxi. 11 sqq. BENGEL.).

4. (V. 28.) **The grace,** &c. *sc.* εἴη, ἔστω; the ordinary benediction at the close of the Epistles; somewhat shorter still, 1 Cor. xvi. 23 [according to the reading that omits ἡμῶν.—J. L.]; shortest of all, Col. iv. 18; for the most part rather more extended; but always somewhat similar. This all need. At the beginning and end of the Epistles he desires grace for the readers, and that the grace of Jesus Christ. And this implies not merely that Christ is alive, but that He is Divine. No one would venture to wish for his readers the grace of any mere man.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. (V. 25.) Advanced Christians are readily forgotten by us in our intercessions, which we regard as less necessary for them, and we think perhaps that they pray themselves, and better than we. We do not reflect, that they are also the most exposed to the enemy, and must contend in the front rank.

2. (V. 26.) Even without the external form, recommended by the Apostle, a hearty brotherly love is a possible thing. And yet it is true that there can scarcely be a prevailing neglect of all the evidences of love, and Christian love itself not grow cool. External rules are of no avail; but the tendency of the inner life creates for itself loving manifestations.

3. (V. 27.) The earnest adjuration shows that Paul perceives how it is the aim of the enemy of truth to withdraw it from the people.—CALVIN: There are always to be found those who will deny that it is well to publish what they yet acknowledge to be good.—BENGEL: *Quod Paulus cum adjuratione jubet, id Roma sub anathemate prohibet.* The passage is fatal to all Bible-prohibition.—*Berl. Bib.:* He must have noticed that there were sciolists amongst them, who might say: Who knows whether it is suitable for all (ch. v. 19; iii. 5)? Who then will now pretend, in contempt of such an adjuration, to forbid the laity to read the Scriptures?—Where, too, is there even a trace of any fixing of an authentic interpretation?—[BENSON: Paul did not look upon ignorance to be the mother of devotion; neither did he recommend it to them, before they read the Scriptures, first to read *a system of divinity*, drawn up by uninspired and fallible men.—WORDSWORTH: This *public reading* of the Epistles was a Divine provision made by the Holy Spirit Himself, not only for the public promulgation of His own will and word, but for the perfect assurance and unswerving belief of all reasonable men in the *genuineness*, *authenticity*, *integrity*, and *inspiration* of that word.—J. L.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

V. 25. *Berl. Bib.:* Pray for us; I need it as well as you.—THEODORET: 1. He desires their intercession; 2. gives them an example of modesty.—*Berl. Bib.:* In the Church militant one member should help another, and may well seek that other's help.

* [ALFORD likewise uses this argument from the aorist in favor of a single act. But it "must certainly not be pressed," says ELLICOTT, "as this tense in the infinitive, especially after verbs of 'hoping,' 'commanding,' &c., is often used in reference not merely to single acts, but to what is either timeless . . ., or simply *eventual*, and dependent on the action expressed by the finite verb."—J. L.]

† [ELLICOTT: "We may perhaps fall back on the reason hinted by THEODORET and expanded by recent expositors,—that a deep sense of the great spiritual importance of this Epistle, not merely to those who were anxious about the κοιμώμενοι (ch. iv. 13), but to *all without exception*, suggested the unusual adjuration."—*Lectures:* "It was well that the common right of '*all the holy brethren*' to the possession of the apostolic writings should be thus explicitly endorsed on the very first of the canonical Epistles."—J. L.]

[BARNES: There is no way in which a people can better advance the cause of piety in their own hearts, than by praying much for their minister.—J. L.]

V. 26. *Berl. Bib.:* The holy kiss is opposed to the false kiss of the world.

V. 27. Earnestness adjures.

Vv. 25–28. A church is well guarded, when 1. mutual intercession is cherished in it; 2. brotherly love is alive in it; 3. the word of God is rightly and faithfully dispensed; and 4. the grace of Jesus Christ rules over all.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

THESSALONIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. OCCASION, TIME, AND PLACE OF WRITING.

THE Second Epistle, on the whole, indicates the same state of things as the First, and moves also in a similar circle of thought. Here too we still find no sort of reference to any Jewish-Christian adversaries of the Apostle. Silvanus and Timothy are still as in the First Epistle his helpers, and joined with him in the composition of the letter. From this very circumstance it may with great probability be inferred, that this Second Epistle also was written at Corinth. After the period marked in Acts xviii. we no longer find Silas with the Apostle. But when the subscription says, *from Athens*, that is here as erroneous as in the First Epistle. As regards both the situation of the Apostle and the state of the church we may observe in the Second Epistle a further development, which shows us that it was written some time after the First; not too soon after, for the First Epistle must have been in operation for some time, if we are to account for the appearance of spurious Epistles (ch. ii. 2); nor yet too long after, certainly not after Paul had left Corinth, for ch. ii. 5; iii. 8, 10 imply, as BLEEK properly remarks (in his Introduction), that Paul had been but once in Thessalonica.* Paul has to endure an obstructive hostility (ch. iii. 1, 2); and this agrees with the latter period of his stay at Corinth (comp. Acts xviii. 9, 12). Moreover, there are branch-churches near Corinth (ch. i. 4); which implies that Paul had already been working there some time (comp. 2 Cor. i. 1; Rom. xvi. 1). In Thessalonica, on the other hand, the development shows itself in three particulars, of which Paul must have been apprised orally or by letter:

1. An outbreak of new persecutions (ch. i. 4) brought with it the necessity for new confirmation in the faith.

2. The excitement in regard to the expectation of the Advent had increased, but in a modified form. They no longer entertained any solicitude as to the dead; on that point 1 Thess. iv. 13 sqq. had given them sufficient light; but as they did not receive the instruction as soberly as 1 Thess. v. required, so their minds had been agitated in another way, partly through terror and consternation, partly through a vehement longing, whilst they supposed that Christ's return was immediately imminent. Suggestions that claimed to be from the Spirit, and even forged apostolic letters (or at least one letter) increased the violent commo-

* [See *Introduction* to the First Epistle, p. 9, and foot-note.—J. L.]

tion (ch. ii. 1, 2). To correct this error, the Apostle insists on the terribly grave character of the catastrophe, that was still to be looked for previously. For believers, indeed, the result will be a happy one; but first the severe trial of the dominant apostasy, of the Antichristian period, will be gone through; and, until this passage is effected (which something at present restrains), the dawn of Christ's blessed Coming is not to be expected. It is not satisfactory to say with De Wette, that Paul seeks to cool off somewhat the too lively expectation. Rather, he seeks to deepen the too lightly cherished hope, and prepare the readers for a time which will be more trying than they supposed. Here likewise, though in a different direction from 1 Thess. iv., it again appears that they were still too little reconciled to the serious path of the cross and of death, and too readily overlooked the ὠδῖνες.

3. It is probably connected with this, that the outgrowth of a disorderly, lazy officiousness had not declined, but had deplorably increased. If their thought was: "Now, indeed, everything that exists is presently dissolving!" so much the more might many break bounds. Against this the Apostle directs, ch. iii. 6 sqq., his sharp word of reproof, and enjoins sterner measures of discipline.

Thus the Second Epistle throughout presupposes the First. The First relates the history of the conversion of the Thessalonians; the Second shows us the progress of their development. The First treats of the possible nearness of the Advent; the Second corrects a misapprehension of this doctrine. The First gives friendly warning against a spirit of disorder; the Second is required to attack more sharply this stubborn evil. Besides, 2 Thess. ii. 15 refers to the First Epistle (the reference at least *includes* our First), and 2 Thess ii. 1 to 1 Thess. iv. 17.

Some expositors, it is true, would invert the relation. In the first place, Grotius supposed that the Man of Sin (ch. ii. 3) was the Emperor Caligula, who attempted to place his statue in the temple; moreover, that ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (ch. ii. 13) is only to be understood by supposing that the Epistle was addressed to Jewish Christians who had come from Palestine, and amongst them Jason; finally, that the mark of genuineness (ch. iii. 17) is to be regarded as a notice communicated by Paul to his readers at once in his first letter. But the whole of this is utterly arbitrary. A mark of genuineness was not wanted by readers until spurious letters were forthcoming, and this again is not conceivable prior to the existence of genuine letters. Nor are the Palestinian recipients of the letter anything but a fiction, invented to render somewhat more plausible that which contradicts all chronology, the reference of the second chapter to Caligula.

Less impossible *à priori* is Ewald's hypothesis, that the Second Epistle, put last as being the shorter, is rather the First, and indeed written from Berœa; that Paul therein corrects the misunderstanding in regard to his preaching of the speedy Advent; that only by this correction is there explained that anxiety on account of such as died before the Advent, which he has now occasion to remove in his second letter (1 Thess. iv. 13 sqq.). It is certainly not *à priori* impossible, that from a misunderstanding of 2 Thess. ii. there should have arisen such an anxiety as 1 Thess. iv. implies, though we would still find more natural a different effect of 2 Thess. ii. But the entire relation of the two Epistles is not at all satisfactorily explained by Ewald's method. In a first letter we can understand the fact and reason of Paul's reverting so particularly to the history of the conversion of the Thessalonians (on that point comp. the exposition of the First Epistle); in a later letter, after that our Second had preceded as the First, we should no longer comprehend it; nor again the fact, that our First Epistle should be so entirely silent respecting the Second, in that passage (1 Thess. ii. 15 [5] sqq.) where the Apostle recounts all his cares and efforts in behalf of the Thessalonians. Of the mention of the churches, in which Paul gloried in the Thessalonians (2 Thess. i. 4), Ewald, who makes him write so at Berœa, has no other than a very forced explanation. At 2 Thess. ii. 2 Ewald himself has to admit, that from that it is evident that our Second Epistle had already been preceded by an earlier Epistle; and should that have been, not our First, but another lost one? That were, however, a groundless conjecture. Nor is there at Berœa adequate opportunity for the vexations which the Apostle had to suffer, ch. iii. 2; for when,

after some time of unobstructed activity in that city, the agitators arrived from Thessalonica, his sojourn there came immediately to an end (Acts xvii. 14). So we will rest in this, that the old established succession of the two Epistles is likewise the correct one.

§ 2. GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE.

The external evidence of the Second Epistle is precisely the same as for the First, and as for the Epistle to the Galatians. An allusion to 2 Thess. iii. 15 sq. see in POLYCARP, *Phil.* 11. If the First Epistle has on a close examination of even its minutest features proved itself to be genuinely Pauline, that of itself tells in favor also of the Second. The latter likewise has never been suspected until the 19th century, and then on so-called internal grounds; first by JOHN ERNST CHRISTIAN SCHMIDT, who began (1801) with merely explaining ch. ii. 1–12 as a Montanistic interpolation, and subsequently called in question the whole Epistle. DE WETTE took sides with him in the first edition of his *Einleitung* [Introduction to the New Test.—J. L.], but subsequently he himself refuted the grounds of doubt. On the other hand, KERN attacked the genuineness of the Epistle in the Tübingen *Zeitschrift*, 1839, II.; after him BAUR, *Paulus*, p. 485 sqq., and in a modified form in his and ZELLER's *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1855, II. p. 150 sqq.; most recently HILGENFELD (who regards the First Epistle as genuine) in his *Zeitschrift für wissensch. Theologie*, 1862, III. p. 242 sqq. Amongst the defenders of the genuineness are especially to be named GUERICKE, *Beiträge*, 1828; REICHE, *authentiæ posterioris ad Th. epistolæ vindiciæ*, 1829; LANGE, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, I. p. 111 sqq.; the expositors LÜNEMANN, 2d ed., with special thoroughness, and HOFMANN. Nothing but what HILGENFELD brings forward of his own remains still unanswered.

Many of the scruples alleged are in the highest degree trifling. One time the Second Epistle should be too like the First, merely an imitation; then again the expressions (of which every Epistle contains a number), that cannot be matched out of other Epistles, are urged as grounds of suspicion. In truth, the Second Epistle has no greater resemblance to the First than the Epistle to the Ephesians has to that to the Colossians, or than many passages of the Epistle to the Romans have to the Epistle to the Galatians; it has, besides, its altogether definite and appropriate aim. Nor are the peculiarities of expression for that reason unpauline, as the exposition will have to show. Amongst other points, indeed, HILGENFELD thinks that ch. i. 6, 7 has an unapostolic sound, as if one merited the kingdom of God by suffering; moreover, that in ch. ii. 15 we light upon an almost Romanizing recommendation of the Apostle's oral and written traditions in general, and so forth; but others will have difficulty in seeing in what way the latter text is so essentially different from 1 Cor. xi. 2 or xv. 3; and as for the former and others such, it is the less necessary to anticipate the exposition, as the result in reference to the question of genuineness is in any event too unimportant; indeed, HILGENFELD himself does not in this relation go further than to say (p. 245): "Certainly we are here brought at least to the extreme limit of the Pauline mode of statement."

A ground of suspicion, on which BAUR especially lays stress, is what we read in ch. ii. 2 of forged letters of the Apostle, taken in connection with the token by which according to ch. iii. 17 the readers were afterwards to recognize the genuineness of an apostolic document. The former passage KERN would not understand of a spurious letter, but rather that it speaks of a misconstruction that had appeared in Thessalonica of the First Epistle. And so it is understood also by BLEEK (*Einl.*, p. 386), who yet regards the Second Epistle likewise as genuine; but in consequence of that interpretation his explanation of ch. iii. 17 proves to be, as HILGENFELD properly remarks (p. 263), very unsatisfactory. If, however, ch. ii. 2 speaks of a forged letter, as almost all since ORIGEN have understood, then it is held to be inconceivable that such a thing should have occurred at so early a period; also that Paul could not possibly have thought already in the beginning, when he had as yet written very few letters, of setting up a mark of genuineness for all subsequent letters: "This is the sign in every Epistle, so I write;" that, moreover, the similar phrase in 1 Cor. xvi. 21 is the natural expression of his love in the salutation, whereas here, in an altogether unpauline manner, it is

made the mark of distinction between genuine and spurious letters; that this takes us to a time when spurious letters had come to be known, and there was occasion to ask for the tests of genuineness.

These arguments lose every appearance even of validity, as soon as we realize to ourselves the state of the case. The point was, to secure the Thessalonians against repeated deception, and for this the best expedient was the precaution that Paul hit upon: "So I write; let no future letter be put upon you as sent by me, which does not contain the salutation written by mine own hand." Now, it is true that only in other two instances, 1 Cor. and Col. iv. 18, do we meet with the same clause: "The salutation by the hand of me, Paul," and in neither of these two places is the same object asserted as in our text. So much the less could a forger, with this and other Epistles before him, have thought of writing: *This is my token in every Epistle.* For, in fact, he did not find it stereotyped in all the Epistles. But the real Paul might so write to the real Thessalonians, whilst using the salutation of cordial love (and this it certainly was in our Epistle likewise first of all) as at the same time a precautionary measure. The salutation was as to its contents a token of love; as to its form, as being written by Paul's own hand, a token of genuineness. But with this it is not at all necessary to suppose, that the same words must continually recur; the only thing required was the autograph subscription. In what way Paul understood the word would be perfectly plain to us, if we possessed a third Epistle to the Thessalonians. It is true, indeed, that such a provision could only have been suggested to Paul by the fact that spurious letters were already known; but according to ch. ii. 2 this was precisely the case. After the Apostle's death the temptation to such forging of letters might easily make itself felt; but why not as well in those times when writing to the churches was still a new thing, so that in any greatly excited circle such a letter readily seemed to be the appropriate means for securing an entrance for peculiar notions.

Thus regarded, everything becomes intelligible; on the other hand, what these critics charge upon the forger is utterly incomprehensible. Looking at the matter in a purely rational light, how foolish would it have been for any one, who desired to forge a letter (and the case, we see, actually occurred), to draw attention so pointedly to this consideration: Suffer no spurious letter to be imposed on you, that has not my own subscription. Was he, forsooth, even in his autograph to imitate the Apostle's handwriting? That would not merely have been foolish, but it would have betrayed such a degree of callous obtuseness of conscience, as could never be reconciled with the character of holy earnestness and thoughtful purity, by which undeniably our Epistle likewise is distinguished. In fact, to infer that the more positively any one says: *I am the Apostle*, there is the stronger ground for suspecting that it is not true—this is surely unjust, so long as the impossibility of his speaking the truth is not shown conclusively. In the Epistle to the Galatians the Apostle speaks with far larger reference to his own person, and yet no one questions the genuineness.

The main ground of doubt, and really the only one that comes into serious consideration, is the contents of the section, ch. ii. 1–12. It was from this point also that SCHMIDT's first doubt started. It is asserted that the doctrine of the Antichrist, which is here presented, is not Pauline. But in this, by dint of reasoning in a circle, people cut out and fashion for themselves a fictitious Paul. Yet what Paul says about the groaning creation occurs only in Rom. viii., and the prospect he holds out of Israel's conversion only in Rom. xi. Is therefore the Epistle to the Romans to be regarded as spurious? On the whole, there is scarcely an Epistle that does not contain some point of doctrine peculiar to itself.

It is said that the expectation of Antichrist rests on a Jewish foundation, especially on the prophecy of the book of Daniel; that by the development of that arose the Christian apocalyptic doctrine; that, as for this being found also in Paul, there is nothing to object to that, since in other respects also he discovers a way of thinking and looking at things that is pervaded by Jewish elements; but that we should beware of attributing to him *more* of what is Jewish, than can on decisive grounds be established. We shall better describe the true state of the case, if we say that the Apostle's faith and thought are rooted in the Old Testament

revelation. What, then, is really Pauline is not to be determined *à priori*, but gathered from the sources; and of these we shall not pronounce any to be spurious, merely because it presents something also that is peculiar, so long as it is not shown that this peculiarity contradicts the nature of the Apostle. But in the question before us this is not at all the case.

Baur, indeed, will detect a great difference between the Epistles to the Corinthians and those to the Thessalonians. The truth is, that here as there we find original features, which, however, most beautifully complete one another. Thus it is with the being clothed upon [2 Cor. v. 2] and changed (1 Cor. xv.), and then the being caught away into the clouds (1 Thess. iv.); the one thing necessarily requires the other. Of the same sort is the relation, when 2 Thess. ii. speaks particularly of Antichrist, whereas 1 Cor. xv. designates death as the last enemy, and so intimates that, prior to the last enemy, other enemies are to be overcome. That 1 Cor. xv. specially harmonizes with Ps. cx., and 1 and 2 Thess. with Daniel, we readily grant; only this proves no contradiction and no difference of authorship. The two supplement each other in the same way as do Rom. v. and 1 Cor. xv. But we shall by no means reckon the doctrine of Antichrist among Rabbinical notions, if along with Daniel, Ps. cx., and other Old Testament places, we think of 1 John ii. 18, 22; iv. 3; 2 John 7; and the Apocalypse.

It is true, they would even form an inconsistency between 1 Cor. and 2 Thess. There, it is said, Paul hopes to live till the Advent, whereas here the aim already is by means of a certain theory to account for the fact, that the Advent cannot yet occur so soon. This, it is alleged, at once implies a tedious, fruitless expectancy, on account of which the non-occurrence is explained on the ground of a certain hindrance; and altogether the prospect carries us to the end of the Roman monarchy, far beyond the stand-point and time of the Apostle. But if Paul looked for the Advent as possibly occurring soon, why might he not also think of the antichristian domination as occurring soon and speedily expiring? he even says himself, that its beginnings are stirring already. There is not a word of correction for such as perhaps began to go astray, because the Advent was so long in coming; on the contrary, Paul sets right only those who supposed that it was even now at the door, and thereupon too lightly overlooked the severe path of the cross and of death, through which they had first to pass. The Apostle merely reminds them of this, but he does not say: It will tarry for a long time yet. Lünemann is quite right in comparing the prophecy of Israel's conversion (Rom. xi. 25 sqq.), of which it might likewise be said, and with just as little reason as of the prophecy in regard to Antichrist, that it points far beyond the stand-point and time of the Apostle. Besides, was not the expectation of the Advent of itself an outlook to the end of the Roman monarchy?

Baur himself, moreover, as good as abandoned that argument, when in 1855, in a new form of his hypothesis, he designated the year 68 as the earliest date of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians. Is it not strange that what was to arouse suspicions against Paul is, a few years after the Apostle's death, accepted without any suspicion at all, as soon as the matter concerns a forger? Already Kern puts the composition of the Epistle into the time between 68 and 70, between Nero's death and the destruction of Jerusalem. For the Antichrist, he thinks, is Nero, whose return, as Rev. xvii. 10, 11 is supposed to show, was looked for; the κατέχων, again, being Vespasian, and the falling away the detestable wickedness of the Jews in the Roman Empire. But De Wette and Lünemann properly declare against such an infusion of the political element into the interpretation of our passage. Baur, on the other hand, going still farther in the track of Kern, comes to this result: that the Second Epistle was written soon after the year 68, but the First Epistle considerably later, after that the expectation of Antichrist had in consequence of his non-appearance subsided (against the latter point see the Introduction to the First Epistle); that, in particular, in 2 Thess. ii. we already have an example of specifically Christian apocalyptic doctrine; that Antichrist is none other than Nero, and that the statements of our Epistle presuppose the view of the Apocalypse; that the divine worship, which according to Rev. xiii. 12–15; xix. 20 is paid to the Beast,

agrees with 2 Thess. ii. 4; and so the Beast which was, and is not, and shall be * (Rev. xvii. 8), to wit Nero, who passed for dead, but who should come again, is meant also in 2 Thess. ii. 6, 7; that the σαλευθῆναι of 2 Thess. ii. 2 has reference to the agitation about the pseudo-Nero after Galba's death, of which Tacitus, *Hist.* ii. 8, gives this account: *Achaia atque Asia falso exterritæ, velut Nero adventaret: vario super exitu ejus rumore, eoque pluribus vivere eum fingentibus credentibusque* (BAUR thinks this delusion was of Christian origin, but what follows does not fit the Christians). *Inde late terror, multis ad celebritatem nominis erectis, rerum novarum cupidine et odio præsentium. Gliscentem in dies famam fors discussit.*

There are altogether three spurious Neros recognized: this one the first; a second in the year 832 U. C. under Titus in Asia Minor (according to Zonaras); the third, twenty years after Nero's death under Domitian, of whom Tacitus, *Hist.* i. 2, makes mention (comp. Suetonius, *Nero*, 57): *Mota prope Parthorum arma falsi Neronis ludibrio.* Our place, says BAUR, refers to the first, as is indicated also by the excitement in the Christian regions of Achaia and Asia. The Epistle, he thinks, was written after that, 1. the σαλευθῆναι, that is, the commotion occasioned by the pseudo-Neronian disturbances, was now passed, the *famam fors discussit* had occurred, and the futility of the affair was already demonstrated. He supposes that the κατέχων was Vespasian, but that whether the temple in Jerusalem was still standing is doubtful, since ch. ii. 4 may be explained otherwise (*Jahrb.*, p. 158). According to this scheme, the author wrote, 2. not until the Apocalypse was pretty generally recognized; and his object was to impress on his readers the wisdom of letting the mistake which had been committed teach them this lesson, that the Advent cannot come before Antichrist comes, nor Antichrist without the apostasy, nor that without the removal of the κατέχων; consequently, Vespasian must first be overthrown! and Antichrist must show himself as a wicked despot, and set himself up as God. For the future, therefore, let us be circumspect, and not suffer ourselves to be deceived by any *falsi Neronis ludibrium.*

This entire hypothesis, however, stands in glaring contradiction to the plain tenor of our Epistle:—2 Thess. ii. 2 does not at all sound as if Christians had to be corrected, who had already once allowed themselves to be deceived into the notion that Antichrist was present, and to them it had now to be said: No doubt He will come, but you must be far more heedful in the examination of the signs. The Apostle rather speaks to such as suppose that the Lord is here, and they must be *reminded* that Antichrist comes first. The σαλευθῆναι of 2 Thess. ii. 2 has a quite different motive from that which BAUR imputes to it. But generally, even as regards the Apocalypse, the whole issue of fantastic, politico-spiritual allusiveness, is by no means the result of correct exposition; and in the case of our text such ideas are nothing but a sheer importation. BAUR's concession (p. 163) is worthy of note, that there is not one of the features in 2 Thess. ii. so specifically Neronian, that the author would have to be at once set down as having failed in his part. BAUR sees nothing in this but the prudently sustained effort to pass for the Apostle Paul. But is it not more prudent, that is, more natural, to admit that the writer is not merely acting a part, but is really the Apostle Paul? If that is the case, and if Paul wrote the letter in the year 54 at the latest, and had already the year before, according to 2 Thess. ii. 5, preached the same thing orally, it then follows that Paul had spoken to his Christians of Antichrist even before Nero became Emperor. LÜNEMANN also is quite right in his remark (and so EWALD, p. 29), that the description in 2 Thess. ii., as compared with the Apocalypse, appears still to be very simple and little developed, and therefore of an earlier date than the latter.

It is at any rate strange, when HILGENFELD expressly asserts to the contrary, that 2 Thess. ii., as contrasted with the Apocalypse, shows an important advance in eschatology, and belongs to a far later period. The result of his combinations is to remove the composition to the time of Trajan. In the mystery of lawlessness he would recognize the Gnostic heresies; most arbitrarily; since the worship of a supreme Deity is something quite different from self-deification. The writer, according to HILGENFELD, is led to speak of the κατέχων by the fact

* [According to the better reading, καὶ πάρεσται.—J. L.]

of a longer delay having already occurred than the Apocalypse gave reason to expect, and therefore also the Second Epistle is in irreconcilable contradiction to the First, which according to HILGENFELD is genuine. The doctrine of the First Epistle, that the day of the Lord comes quite suddenly and at a time that cannot be calculated, like a thief in the night, is not, he says, the doctrine of the Second, which rather specifies very distinct tokens of Christ's return, to wit, the rise of the apostasy, and the self-deification of the Man of Sin. Had Paul really taught thus in Thessalonica (v. 5), he would then in the First Epistle have again completely renounced his own doctrine. But the whole of this assertion is perfectly groundless. As regards the *κατέχων*, we cannot here further anticipate the exposition; every one must allow that an explanation which leads to such a result as that of HILGENFELD, cannot at least be *à priori* the only possible one. But that the signs of the time, mentioned in the Second Epistle, are to be considered as in irreconcilable contradiction to the coming as a thief in the night, is an extremely arbitrary assertion. Certainly the time and the hour are not at all thereby determined, and, on the other hand, to regard the signs of the time is everywhere required of the disciples. Even the First Epistle furnishes such a sign, namely, the utter, careless security itself of those who are no disciples (ch. v. 3). The apostasy, of which the Second Epistle speaks, is nothing but the highest development of that evil disposition, and when the deceptive power of the Man of Sin comes to an end in the Lord's taking him away* by the Spirit of His mouth (2 Thess. ii. 8), that will be the consummation of those pangs which come suddenly on her who is with child (1 Thess. v. 3). The whole is aimed merely at a wicked, careless security. "But the day," says the Apostle to the Christians (v. 4), "does not come on you as a thief, for ye are sober and watchful;" and again: "You do not allow yourselves to be befooled by the deceptions of the antichristian period, and have your eyes open for the signs of the time." One must read with a preconceived opinion, to assert the irreconcilableness of the two Epistles.

The development of the doctrine beyond the Apocalypse HILGENFELD sees especially in this, that the antichristian ruler, who in the latter is distinguished from the false prophet, already in our Epistle coalesces with him. But is it not far more natural to acknowledge that here we have rather a first step, on which, not yet clearly discriminated, there comes forth the party by whom the lying wonders are performed, the object of which is to secure credit for the self-deification of the Man of Sin? In that case, however, 2 Thess. ii. does not presuppose the Apocalypse, but precedes it. On the whole, the prophecy of Daniel is quite sufficient as the basis of 2 Thess ii.; even the exaltation above all that is called God or that is worshipped meets us already in that place (ch. xi. 36; vii. 8). This old prediction of the consummation, by its being concentrated in a head, of enmity against God and His anointed, is renewed by the Apostle, whose own eye is opened, and he thus foretells the acme of the wickedness of which the beginnings are already stirring; all, as BAUR admits, without a single specific Neronian feature; in truth, all *before even Nero was Emperor*. It is very conceivable how the Christians might subsequently fall into the way of finding at once in the Emperor Nero the Antichrist whom they expected; but even this *presupposes* the existence of the prophecy of Antichrist. This knowledge is also of importance for the interpretation of the Apocalypse.

The question as to the genuineness must therefore be decided essentially by the exposition of the second chapter.

§ 3. COURSE OF THOUGHT IN THE EPISTLE.

In this case the old division of chapters has, on the whole, hit the right mark. LÜNEMANN, indeed, would divide differently. After the salutation (ch. i. 1, 2) and introduction (vv. 3–12), he distinguishes a doctrinal part (ch. ii. 1–12) and a hortatory (ch. ii. 13–iii. 15), to which are added in conclusion the salutation and benediction (vv. 16–18). But it is, in the first place, unsuitable to describe ch. i. 3–12 as being simply introduction; then the distinc-

* [According to the reading followed by RIGGENBACH in 2 Thess. ii. 8.—J. L.]

tion between a doctrinal and a hortatory part is rather a modern than an apostolic conception; and, moreover, it is overlooked that the exhortation in ch. ii. 13–17 belongs strictly to the instruction concerning Antichrist, whereas τὸ λοιπόν, ch. iii. 1, obviously introduces the closing section. The last point is recognized by HOFMANN, who, however, on his part infers too much from it, namely, that the exhortation in ch. iii. forms a sort of supplement, unconnected with the main instruction of ch. ii., and that, consequently, even the officious idleness here reproved by the Apostle does not at all originate in eschatological excitement. But that is to assert more than can be proved.

According to what has been said, our Epistle divides itself as follows:

1. Ch. i. contains an address for the consolation of the readers under the fresh outbreak of persecutions; after the salutation (vv. 1, 2), the Apostle thanks God for their growth in faith (vv. 3, 4), cheers them by the prospect of judgment and salvation (vv. 5–10), and prays that God would make them partakers of perfection (vv. 11, 12).

2. Ch. ii. supplies instruction and exhortation in regard to the antichristian consummation of evil; the warning, against allowing themselves to be easily misled into the notion of the day of the Lord being at the door (vv. 1, 2), is confirmed by reminding them that, as he had already told them orally, the Man of Sin must previously be revealed (vv. 3–5); that the mystery of lawlessness is still for the present restrained by an obstructive power, and will only reach its height when this is removed, and will then also come to its end by the appearing of the Lord (vv. 6–8); of what sort the lying power of the enemy will be, is hereupon more exactly described (vv. 9–12); but the Christians, whom God saves from this ruin, he so much the more encourages to stand fast, and implores in their behalf the Divine guardianship (vv. 13–17).

3. Ch. iii. closes the Epistle with regulations in regard, chiefly, to those who walked disorderly; after a short introduction, in which he seeks their prayers, and commends to them generally a faithful perseverance in the true Christian spirit (vv. 1–5), he gives particular directions as to the treatment of those who will not desist from a pragmatical idleness (vv. 6–16). To this are attached in few words the parting salutation and benediction (vv. 17, 18).

The Epistle is short, but not on that account the less important. The way in which the Apostle comforts his readers by a reference to the righteous judgment of God, is of itself very instructive; still more the peculiar instruction respecting the impending consummation of hostility to God, which deserves the more to be laid to heart, the more the signs of the time reveal the impress of the antichristian nature; and, lastly, the Apostle's severity likewise against all sham-spiritual indolence is to be well considered, and the discipline, the exercise of which he requires from the church, is in the highest degree fitted to hold forth a mirror to the Christendom of our day.

As to the literature, there is nothing more to be noted, after what has been cited in § 2. What was said in the Introduction to the First Epistle, holds good also for the Second, except only that KOCH's Commentary does not extend to the Second Epistle.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

THESSALONIANS.

I.

Address for the Consolation of the readers under the fresh outbreak of persecutions.

Ch. I. 1–12.

After the salutation (vv. 1, 2), the Apostle thanks God for their growth in faith (vv. 3, 4), cheers them by the prospect of judgment and salvation (vv. 5–10), and prays that God would make them partakers of perfection (vv. 11, 12).

1 Paul, and Silvanus, and Timotheus [Timothy], unto the church of the Thes-
2 salonians in God our Father[1] and the Lord Jesus Christ: Grace unto you, and
peace, from God our[1] Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.
3 We are bound to thank [give thanks to][2] God always for you, brethren, as
it is meet, because that your faith groweth exceedingly, and the charity [love,
4 ἀγάπη] of every one of you all[3] toward each other aboundeth; so that we our-
selves[3] glory in you in the churches of God, for your patience and faith in all
5 your persecutions and tribulations [the afflictions][4] that ye endure: *which is* a
manifest token [a token, ἔνδειγμα] of the righteous judgment of God, that ye
may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer:
6 seeing [if indeed][4] *it is* a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation
7 to them that trouble you [to those who afflict you affliction],[4] and to you, who
are troubled [afflicted], rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed [at
the revelation of the Lord Jesus, ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ Κ. Ἰ.] from heaven with His
8 mighty angels [with the angels of His power, μετ' ἀγγέλων δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ], in flam-
ing fire,[6] taking vengeance on them that [rendering vengeance to those who, διδόντος
ἐκδίκησιν τοῖς] know not God, and that obey not[7] the gospel of our Lord Jesus
9 Christ:[8] who shall be punished with [shall suffer punishment, δίκην τίσουσιν,]
everlasting destruction from the presence [face][9] of the Lord, and from the
10 glory of His power; when He shall come to be glorified in His saints, and to
be admired in all them that believe [those who believed][10] (because our testi-
11 mony among you [to you, ἐφ' ὑμᾶς] was believed), in that day. Wherefore [To
which end, Εἰς ὅ] also we pray always for you, that our God would count [may
count, ἀξιώσῃ] you worthy of *this* [the, τῆς] calling, and fulfil all the good
pleasure of *His* goodness [every desire of goodness],[11] and the work of faith
12 with power; that the name of our Lord Jesus Christ[12] may be glorified in you,
and ye in Him, according to the grace of our God, and the Lord Jesus Christ.[13]

[1] V. 1.—[Sin.[1] inserts καί before πατρί—the reading of two cursive manuscripts, but corrected in Sin.[2]—J. L.]
V. 2.—ἡμῶν is wanting only in B. D. E.; it is found in the majority of uncials (also Sin.), versions, and Fathers. [It is bracketed by Lachmann, and cancelled by Tischendorf and Alford.—J. L.]

[2] V. 3.—[Εὐχαριστεῖν; see 1 Thess. ii. 13, Critical Note 2.—Sin.[1] omits πάντων.—J. L.]

[3] V. 4.—For ἡμᾶς αὐτούς, Sin., with B. and a few cursives, reads αὐτοὺς ἡμᾶς.—*Revision:* "Grammatically, ὑμῶν belongs only to διωγμοῖς, and only ταῖς θλίψεσιν to αἷς ἀνέχεσθε."—In the First Epistle E. V. always renders θλῖψις *affliction*, and often elsewhere.—J. L.]

[4] V. 6.—[εἴπερ, hypothetical, not causal; see the Exegetical Note 4. Vulgate, *si tamen;* English Version in four out of the other five cases of εἴπερ, *if so be (that)*, and so Alford and Ellicott here; De Wette and Lünemann, *wenn anders*.—J. L.]

[5] V. 6.—[τοῖς θλίβουσιν ὑμᾶς θλίψιν. Ellicott, who retains the Greek order: "The change seems to preserve more clearly the antithesis, and also to bring more into prominence the '*lex talionis*' that is tacitly referred to."—J. L.]

[6] V. 8.—πυρὶ φλογὸς is given by Sin. A. K. L., nearly all the minuscules, Chrysostom and others; φλογὶ πυρός, by B. D. E. F. G. [Scholz, Lachmann, Wordsworth, Ellicott]. Tischendorf prefers the former, because the other as being the more common might more easily arise from correction, and in other places where it is genuine there is never any appearance of change.

[7] V. 8.—[Or: *and to those who obey not.* This construction, naturally suggested by the repetition of the article, is adopted by very many, and understood to designate a different class from the μὴ εἰδόσι θεόν. See in opposition to this view Exegetical Note 4, and in favor of it the *Revision* of this verse, Note a.—J. L.]

[8] V. 8.—Χριστοῦ is added in Sin., A. F. G., and many versions; it is wanting in B. D. E. K. L., Coptic and others. —[Riggenbach follows Knapp and Lachmann in bracketing Χρ.; it is omitted by Bengel in his German Version, Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott.—J. L.]

[9] V. 9.—[προσώπου. Comp. Matt. xviii. 10; Luke i. 76; 2 Cor. iv. 6; 1 Pet. iii. 12; Rev. xx. 11.—J. L.]

[10] V. 10.—All the uncials [and critical editions] give πιστεύσασιν; only a few minuscules have πιστεύουσιν.

[11] V. 11.—[πᾶσαν εὐδοκίαν ἀγαθωσύνης. See the Exegetical Note 6, and *Revision*, Notes q and r. *Desire* (Rom. x. 1), though not precisely an equivalent for εὐδοκία, is in this instance convenient, and at least more readily intelligible than Ellicott's phrase, *every good pleasure of goodness*. Am. Bible Union: *all the good pleasure of goodness*.—J. L.]

[12] V. 12.—In this case Sin. does not stand with Codd. A. F. G., which add Χριστοῦ. [Riggenbach omits it, as do Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth, Ellicott. Knapp and Lachmann bracket.—J. L.]

[13] V. 12.—[Or: *our God and Lord Jesus Christ.* So Riggenbach and some others. Generally, however, this case is regarded as an exception to the ordinary rule of grammar, on the ground that "Κύριος Ἰ. Χ. is a common title of Christ, and is often used independently of all which precedes it" (Middleton).—J. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. (Vv. 1, 2.) See the First Epistle.

2. (Vv. 3, 4.) **We are bound,** &c.—As in 1 Thess. i. 2, only that he there says simply εὐχαριστοῦμεν, and here declares the obligation (ch. ii. 13), in the earnestness of his spirit, drawn from the greatness of the grace; *urgente animi exultatione* (Bengel): We are bound to do this, and it is a debt which we shall never be able fully to discharge. It is by no means obvious, why this should be unpauline! is it only because we do not so read in any other Epistle?! The words, **as it is meet,** are referred by some only to ὀφείλομεν, as confirmatory of the obligation, and, taken thus, they seem to be somewhat dull and pointless; better therefore: "so to *give thanks*, as the greatness of the unmerited favor deserves;" Bengel: *ob rei magnitudinem;* Hofmann: *as the state of the case requires.* Theophylact (along with another explanation): *in a worthy manner, by word and deed; for this is true thanksgiving.* Too subtle is Lünemann's interpretation; who, because καθὼς does not mark the degree (though it does the way and manner), and because the insertion of ἀδελφοί forbids the close backward reference to εὐχαριστεῖν (but why?), would connect ἄξιον closely with what follows: "as it is meet, *because*." But it is more natural to understand ὅτι thus: "We are bound to give thanks (for this), *that*."* Ὑπεραυξάνειν is such an emphatic expression of entire commendation as the Apostle is fond of; αὐξάνειν is used elsewhere transitively, but once also as intransitive, Acts vi. 7; and so the compound here: "your faith groweth even beyond expectation;† and love increaseth‡ continually." Paul thankfully acknowledges the fulfilment of his wishes and exhortations (1 Thess. iii. 12; iv. 10); Rieger: the fruit of his exhortations and intercessions. Faith and love, of which Timothy (1 Thess. iii. 6) had reported the existence among the Thessalonians, had only become stronger in the tempests; at 1 Thess. i. 3 he had added ὑπομονὴ τῆς ἐλπίδος, and that follows here in another form.—**Of every one of you all,** he thus quite explicitly applies it to every individual; **toward each other;** he speaks therefore of brotherly love. How can Paul thus praise, when in chh. ii. and iii. he has yet to add reproof? Olshausen well: Even those excrescences (we add: which were found rather in individuals merely) were at least excrescences simply from a good stock. There is something of cordial encouragement in the fact, that Paul first recognizes the good that he finds in them, even though with some their faith and love are still lacking in wisdom.—**So that we ourselves,** not others merely, **glory in you.** Hofmann thinks this would require a καί, and prefers to understand it thus: *we of our own accord, without being prompted;* too artificial. De Wette (and Chrysostom before him) recalls 1 Thess. i. 8: "We have no need to speak of it, since everywhere people are telling of it;" whereas here: "Not merely do others talk to us and speak of it everywhere, but we also (overcoming a modest reserve) must in our exceeding joy proclaim it." To be sure, attention is not drawn to this contrast by any particle of time; it at once results, however, from a mere comparison of the two places. Paul not merely thanks God; he glories also before men. Instead of the *Recepta* καυχᾶσθαι, A. B. Sin. 17 [Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott] give the rarer and on that account, perhaps, the preferable ἐγκαυχᾶσθαι (A. B., not Sin., write ἐνκ.), which at the most slightly strengthens the sense; καυχ. ἐν means *to place one's honor in something, to boast of a thing* (1 Cor. i. 31; iii. 21); there Paul forbids to glory in any men whatever; does he not here do so himself? By no means; he means to boast, not of the Thessalonians as men, but only of the work of God in them (1 Thess. ii. 19). The relation is the same as between the ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκειν that is forbidden (Gal. i. 10, flattery of the old man) and that which is enjoined (1 Cor. x. 33, the cherishing of the new man with tender fidelity). He boasts of them **in the churches of God,** those of Achaia, where he is sojourning; Lünemann: Corinth and its branch churches (the plural points to the surrounding region, comp. Rom. xvi. 1): an advance on 1 Thess.

* [Lünemann's construction, however, is the common one, and is preferred by Alford, Ellicott, Webster and Wilkinson: "Added to introduce the special subject of thankfulness, as one that fully justifies the assertion, εὐχ. ὀφείλομεν."—J. L.]

† [*über die Erwartung.* Better in the version: *übersehr, exceedingly, beyond measure.*—J. L.]

‡ [*mehrt sich;* in the version, *zunimmt.*—J. L.]

i. 3. Without any reason HILGENFELD (p. 243) would detect a disagreement with 2 Cor. i. 1, alleging that the genuine Paul does not at all describe the churches of Achaia as properly churches along with that of Corinth. The simple fact is, that in that place of the Corinthian Epistle he does not do so, it being surely equally possible for him to address a large number of saints, or to take them together as churches; but if one were disposed to extort from 2 Cor. i. 1 the idea that the scattered Christians of Achaia had not yet been gathered into churches, we should then have to infer also from Rom. i. 7; Phil. i. 1; Col. i. 2, that no churches had yet been organized in Rome, Philippi, Colosse, when Paul wrote to the Christians of those places!—BENGEL's reference of the ὑπὲρ, &c. to the remote εὐχαριστεῖν is unnatural; it is rather a closer definition of ἐγκαυχ. ἐν ὑμῖν: **for your patience and** (your) **faith**; their endurance stands first; the thing gloried in is, that they stood their ground not merely against a single attack; the root of genuine patience is faith, which is then again in its turn purified by patience. In faith everything is concentrated (1 Thess. iii. 7); it is not of itself the same thing as hope [DE WETTE] (1 Thess. i. 3); nor, because πίστεως is connected with ὑπομονῆς by one article, are we required (as OLSHAUSEN and LÜNEMANN suppose) to assume for πίστις the meaning of *fidelity*. No doubt, by omitting the second article Paul comprehends patience and faith, so to speak, under one conception; faith, however, retains the sense which it commonly bears elsewhere (and for the Greeks that is certainly less remote from the idea of fidelity than for us). There may be an endurance that does not proceed from faith, that is, from holding fast by the invisible God; and this would have no value; but just as little would a faith, that did not approve itself by its own steadfastness in affliction. In Rev. xiii. 10 also the two are joined together. The manifestation of both takes place **in all your persecutions and the afflictions that ye endure**, patiently bear, HOFMANN; the αἷς ἀνέχεσθε in the second member answers to the ὑμῶν of the first. The persecutions proceed from hostile men; θλίψεσιν is more general, and presents the idea, how painful and distressing the suffering is in the experience of it; αἷς, it is generally said, is an attraction for ἅς; LÜNEMANN, for ὧν; both constructions occur; in the New Testament elsewhere always the genitive (Col. iii. 13, and often). The present ἀνέχεσθε (over against the aorist of 1 Thess. ii. 14) shows that there had been a fresh outbreak of persecutions.

3. (V. 5.) **A token**, &c.—ἔνδειγμα is not equivalent to εἰς ἔνδ. (cod. 73) [slightly favored also by the Syriac, and the Vulgate *in exemplum*.—J. L.], nor does it belong appositionally to the ὑμεῖς concealed in ἀνέχεσθε (that would have required ὄντες ἔνδειγμα, besides yielding no good sense); but it is (similarly as in Rom. viii. 3) an apposition to the clause αἷς ἀνέχεσθε, see WINER, § 59. 9;* it is to be regarded as a nominative (DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN [ALFORD, ELLICOTT, WEBSTER and WILKINSON, &c.]), not an accusative; hence: *which is a proof*; ἔνδειγμα does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, though ἔνδειξις does (Rom. iii. 25, 26; Phil. i. 28). It is not the mere suffering of tribulation that is of itself an evidence of the judgment, as being perhaps an atonement for sins (ESTIUS), or as an indication that the judgment must come; such is not the effect of mere suffering in itself, but of suffering in patience and faith, and accordingly αἷς ἀνέχεσθε is said to those whose patience and faith can be boasted of; and ἀνέχεσθε itself implies the patient acceptance. This patient endurance, then, is a proof of the righteous judgment of God. But to what extent is it so? The great majority of interpreters (CALVIN, PELT, DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN, HOFMANN, &c.) understand ἔνδειγμα (without warrant) as a presage of the *future* judgment, which has not yet appeared but is certainly impending; a token from which it may be inferred that it *will* come; so also LUTHER: which shows that God *will* judge rightly. They say that ἔνδειξις so stands in Phil. i. 28; but the perdition and salvation, whose evidence is there spoken of, are by no means impending merely in the future, but are already in progress at present, comp. 1 Cor. i. 18; and the ἔνδειξις of the righteousness of God, of which Rom. iii. 25 sq. speaks, is altogether meant as present. In behalf, however, of the view that our text speaks of a presage of the future judgment, there is alleged 1. the article, as indicating the judgment κατ' ἐξοχήν, and 2. the connection with vv. 6, 7, where there is very explicit mention of the future retribution. Granting the latter point, still, if ἔνδειγμα in v. 5 by itself is to mean a presage, its relation to the following εἰς τὸ καταξ. is anything but clear. ESTIUS, BENGEL, HOFMANN, and others, make the latter clause dependent on ἀνέχεσθε, and it is true that this would not necessarily lead to the Catholic doctrine of merit (just as little as Rom. viii. 17), but in the present connection it would have this inconvenience of depressing ἔνδειγμα, &c. into a subordinate parenthesis, whereas plainly in that word is to be seen the new principal thought, the beginning of the new line of thought, which is then carried forward in v. 6 sqq. This is perceived by DE WETTE and LÜNEMANN, who are therefore essentially correct in assuming that εἰς τὸ καταξ. depends on δικ. κρίσεως; but how? shall it mean merely: *with reference to the fact, that?* or shall it be an epexegetical conclusion, like 2 Cor. viii. 6: *whose result will be, that* (LÜNEMANN)? or shall it even express simply the substance of the judgment (DE WETTE)? THEOPHYLACT even takes it as an equivalent to ὅπερ ἐστὶ καταξ. DE WETTE gives this paraphrastic explanation of the connection: By their steadfastness in persecution the Thessalonians approve themselves as worthy of the kingdom of God, and from this subjective worthiness may be inferred the objective righteous judgment of God, by which it is realized. But this is a singular confounding of two different modes of viewing the causal relation, as it were thus: Which steadfast suffering, since it shows what sort of people you are, is also a presage of what we have to expect from the righteous judgment of God, in pronouncing you worthy;—evidently an artificial and forced thought, which would still be but very unintelligibly expressed.* But on the whole it is

* [Rather to all that precedes from ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑπομονῆς to ἀνέχεσθε. So FRITZSCHE, DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN, ALFORD, ELLICOTT. See the *Revision*, Note k.—J. L.]

* [The above is scarcely an exact representation of DE WETTE's view. He indeed parenthetically suggests as a possible explanation of εἰς τό the idea of the *substance* or *purport* (*Inhalt*) of God's righteous judgment, as he does also that of LÜNEMANN (*Folge, result*); but he himself plainly prefers allowing the Greek phrase its usual final force: *der Zweck des göttlichen Rechtsspruches*. Nor does DE WETTE speak of the subjective worthiness being realised by means of the objective judgment of God; what he says is, that by the latter the Thessalonians shall be actually and in fact translated into God's kingdom: *das Rechts-*

always best, wherever it is possible, to hold fast in *εἰς τό* the idea of *aim*. Add to this the arbitrariness of understanding ἔνδειγμα as a foretoken of something future, as also HILGENFELD remarks.

The preference, therefore, is due to the interpretation, which we find not quite distinctly in ZWINGLI, and then in OLSHAUSEN, needing only a somewhat more rigorous confirmation; the interpretation, namely, according to which ἔνδειγμα denotes the evidence of God's righteous judgment already at present in force. The article can be no obstacle to this, since the judgment of God, present and future, is one process (like eternal life, John xvii. 3); and vv. 6, 7 also form no counter-argument, for there we are shown that coming issue of the judgment, of which the present judicial administration (v. 5) is the pioneer. But how, then, can the patient endurance of suffering be described as a manifestation of the already present judgment of God?

Here it is of importance rightly to understand the scriptural conception of righteousness and judgment. Now since the righteousness of God is certainly not synonymous with grace, we must not confound these ideas; it is the self-consistent relation of His holy love to the free creature; dispensing on both sides, to the believer according to his faith, to the unbeliever according to his unbelief. A judgment awaits also the former; OLSHAUSEN refers to 1 Pet. iv. 17, 18; likewise 1 Cor. xi. 32 points us to a judgment for discipline and purification; thus: God fulfils in you His righteous judgment, not for your destruction, but for your trial, that He may be able to declare you worthy of the kingdom; He proves your standing in faith, and there is a righteous requital also in this, that He rewards faith with patience; or as STOCKMEYER beautifully and clearly carries out the idea on this one side (in an unprinted sermon; see the Homiletic hints on 1 Thess. iv. 1-8): "First of all he represents to them the judgment of God as something, whereof they are now already permitted, in the midst of their tribulation, to have an experience in the highest degree joyful and comforting. That the Thessalonians were able to abide so patient in persecution, and so firm in faith, was already an evidence of the righteousness of God. Thereby God already proved Himself in their case to be the righteous rewarder of all that is good. For their obedience, in that they had received the gospel, God rewarded them by bestowing on them new grace, and new strength to suffer for the gospel's sake, without becoming weary and faint-hearted (Matt. xiii. 12)." What one might find to be wanting in this statement is, at the most, that it would suit the expression, *proof of the righteousness*, better than it does the one before us, *proof of the righteous judgment*. It must therefore be supplemented by remarking, first, that for believers also the operation of the Divine righteousness comes indeed to be an effective judgment, but that it is a strong consolation to fall into the hand of God, and not into the hand of men; moreover, as VON GERLACH notes, that it is the most frightful token (not merely a presage) of bursting doom, when God so hardens the ungodly that they persecute His children. Even this, however, must redound to the advantage of the latter.

The thought of our passage, therefore, would be this: Steadfastly and believingly ye endure your persecutions; that is a proof of God's righteous judgment, of His inviolably self-consistent work of winnowing; which proof is to the end (*εἰς τό*)* that ye should be deemed worthy, that He should be able to pronounce you worthy, of the kingdom of God. Toward this mark the judicial and sifting operation of God is working; it will prevail with those who allow His judgment to take effect on them to their purification. It is obvious that, taken thus, *εἰς τὸ καταξ.* acquires a much better sense. Of course, as STOCKMEYER goes on to say, this declaration of judgment, that already takes place at present, stands in closest connection with that last perfect demonstration of it, which is the hope of all believers. (The connection with v. 6 sqq.: If it is a righteous thing that God should some day render a perfect retribution, there is already now a proof of His righteousness, in directing His judgments toward that end.)†

The kingdom of God, whereof we should be accounted worthy, is the holy dominion which, in distinction from the Church of the present time (the kingdom in the form of a servant), shall one day be revealed by the return of the King in victorious glory. Since flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom, what avails for that is the death of the old man, as the Apostle says: **for which ye also suffer**; he says *also*, to express the agreement that exists between their actual experience and God's plan.‡ The ὑπέρ is understood by most to mean: *in order to its attainment;* and this again would not express any legal meritoriousness, any more than Rom. viii. 17, but would amount to this: Ye suffer for your faith in it, your confession of it, your faithfulness to it, when grace had received you. HILGENFELD insists on the meaning, not: *in order to its attainment*, but: *in order to its promotion;* similarly HOFMANN: *to introduce this state of things;* and even so there would be no warrant for the assertion of the former, that there is here betrayed an unapostolic estimate of martyrdom. But ὑπέρ (as in Rom. i. 5; Acts v. 41) means: *in reference thereto, in behalf of the kingdom*, and includes the two ideas of serving it and participating in it.

4. (Vv. 6-8.) **If indeed it is a righteous thing**, &c.—The thought is expressed hypothetically, for the very purpose of strengthening its im-

urtheil Gottes, durch welches sie wirklich und in der That in das Reich Gottes werden versetzt werden. He errs merely in restricting the Divine judgment to its future manifestation.—J. L.]

* [*Lectures:* "Such being the design and tendency, and such the certain result, of God's righteous judgment concerning His afflicted saints."—J. L.]

† [I cannot but fear that the above elaborate discussion still leaves the matter somewhat obscure. ELLICOTT, perhaps too rigorously, confines the δικαία κρίσις to that which "will be displayed at the Lord's second coming;" but he appears to be quite right in saying, that "to refer it solely to present sufferings, as perfecting and preparing the Thessalonians for future glory (OLSH.), is to miss the whole point of the sentence: the Apostle's argument is that their endurance of suffering in faith is a token of God's righteous judgment and of a future reward, which will display itself in rewarding the patient sufferers, as surely as it will inflict punishment on their persecutors." In my *Revision* and *Lectures* the case was put thus: "The patience and faith of the Thessalonians under persecution indicated the righteous judgment of God, by which they were even now, and hereafter were to be still more gloriously, accredited as meet heirs of His kingdom; just because, and in so far as, there was thus indicated the realization in their character and condition, as God's justified, sanctified, and at the same time suffering people, of the very grounds on which, by the laws of that kingdom, such a judgment must proceed."—J. L.]

‡ [ELLICOTT: "The καί with a species of consecutive force supplies a renewed hint of the connection between the suffering and the καταξιωθῆναι, κ.τ.λ." ALFORD: "q. d. *ye accordingly*."—J. L.]

port, and to indicate that it is altogether incontestable, the writer appealing to his reader's own judgment. THEOPHYLACT: The hearers cannot but say: ἀλλὰ μὴν δίκαιον. *It is a righteous thing with God* [Vulgate: *apud Deum;* Syriac = *coram Deo.*—J. L.], righteousness is therein fulfilled; *to recompense*, properly *to render back* (1 Thess. iii. 9), *to those who afflict you affliction, and to you who are afflicted relaxation, release, rest, refreshment* (2 Cor. ii. 12, 13); in opposition to θλῖψις, 2 Cor. vii. 5; viii. 13; similarly ἀνάψυξις, Acts iii. 19; comp. also the resting in Rev. xiv. 13. For the present, he exhibits merely that negative side of the δόξα, for which the afflicted person first longs, freedom from earth's sorrows; the positive side comes afterward, vv. 10, 12. —**With us,** says the Apostle in the assured joy of faith; without warrant is BENGEL's explanation (and EWALD's): *us, the saints in Israel;* DE WETTE would understand it generally: *with us, Christians at large;* that may well be involved in the remoter deduction; but obviously the immediate suggestion of the actual phrase is: *with us, the in like manner afflicted Apostles* (ch. iii. 2), the foremost champions of the faith [ALFORD and ELLICOTT: the writers of the Epistle; WEBSTER and WILKINSON: Paul.—J. L.]. Looking back from the final retribution (v. 6), we see that all the previous dealing also (v. 5) is righteous throughout. Of course, the θλίβεσθαι is not of itself meritorious, but v. 7 likewise takes for granted θλιβομένους of steadfast faith (v. 4); so that HILGENFELD's censure of an unpauline thought falls to the ground.—Rest and refreshment will God give **at the revelation of the Lord Jesus;** it is a far more forced construction, when GROTIUS would refer this specification of time to the remote καταξιωθῆναι. *Of the Lord Jesus* is a genitive of the object, though He is also the subject of it. *Revelation* is the same thing as παρουσία; only there is still more conveyed by ἀποκάλυψις; not merely that He will be present, but also that He will unveil Himself in His glory (1 Cor. i. 7; Luke xvii. 30), whereas He is now hid in heaven (Col. iii. 3, 4), and is only invisibly nigh to us (Matt. xxviii.). The way and manner of His coming is shown by what is added: **from heaven,** comp. 1 Thess. iv. 16; **with the angels of His power,** comp. 1 Thess. iii. 13; the expression means that they belong to His power, therefore also form His power, are its servants and executors. Comp. the στρατεύματα of heaven, Rev. xix. 14. Not: *with His strong angels, mighty angels* (THEOPHYLACT expressly, δυνατῶν), as if δυνάμεως were an adjectival definition of ἀγγ., and αὐτοῦ were to be connected with ἀγγ. HOFMANN (because it is not said: μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων τῆς δυν. αὐτοῦ) would understand it as meaning *with a host of angels,** ἀγγ. being put first emphatically, to distinguish the heavenly forces from all of an earthly kind (but for this there was no occasion), and δύναμις signifying an army-force likewise in Luke x. 19; xxi. 26 (?), and in the Septuagint for צָבָא; αὐτοῦ, finally, he refers to what follows. This whole view is too artificial; and when he takes the words αὐτοῦ ἐν πυρὶ φλογὸς διδόντος together, and refers them to God, and at the same time regards ἐν τῇ ἀποκ. &c. as the beginning of this participial construction, this is, to say the least, as cumbrous as the ordinary view, according to which ἐν τῇ ἀπ. &c. more closely defines what goes before.—There might certainly be a doubt as to where ἐν πυρὶ φλογός belongs (the variation which we have noted meets us in like manner at Acts vii. 30; the *Recepta* means *flaming fire, glowing fire*, not faintly burning). Too subtile is THEOPHYLACT's remark, that the expression denotes fire that burns merely, and gives no light, it being merely consuming for sinners, and for the righteous merely luminous. It is possible to refer it to what follows as a specification of detail (THEODORET: τῆς τιμωρίας τὸ εἶδος; HILGENFELD: In point of fact the fiery flame belongs immediately to the punishment);* but it may also be regarded as the last feature in the description of the revelation, and this is still simpler [and so ALFORD and ELLICOTT]. THEOPHYLACT recognizes both explanations, and refers for the second to Ps. xcvii. 3. The Lord is revealed in flaming fire, as in the burning bush, or as on Sinai; His throne is [not, as in E. V., *is like.*—J. L.] glowing flame (Dan. vii. 9); as in the Old Testament God, so here Christ comes in fire; thus shall His day also be revealed (1 Cor. iii. 13); this agrees with the δόξα at His coming (Matt. xxv. 31); somewhat more remote is the glowing flame of His eyes (Rev. xix. 12); He Himself is a consuming fire (Heb. x. 27; xii. 29); comp., moreover, in the Old Testament, Is. xxix. 6; xxx. 30.

The terrible splendor of His majesty, which consumes all opposition, is concisely, but powerfully, delineated. We are not to inquire curiously into what is physical in this manifestation; not till the *last* end will the fire that melts the elements come in power (2 Pet. iii. 7, 10); but at every epoch of judgment fire is also the figure of the purifying ardor of the Holy Ghost, consuming all impurity; comp. Matt. iii. 11, 12.—The reference of what follows, (Jesus) **rendering vengeance,** dispensing punishment, is by HOFMANN without reason felt to be a difficulty. The Greek expression answers in the Septuagint to the Hebrew נָתַן נְקָמָה, Ezek. xxv. 14, and elsewhere; comp. ἔκδικος, 1 Thess. iv. 6; ποιεῖν ἐκδίκησιν, Luke xviii. 7; see also Luke xxi. 22, 23. The Apostle now traces back to the general Divine administration what he had previously promised to the Thessalonians in particular. Jesus will execute the Divine judgment on **those who know not God;** that it is not simply a want of knowledge, but a criminal blindness, that is here intended, is evident; comp. 1 Thess. iv. 5; instead of seeking God (Acts xvii. 27), many hold the truth down [κατεχόντων, *depress, repress*] in unrighteousness (Rom. i. 18); in angry defiance, like Pharaoh (Ex. v. 2). In the First Epistle the Gentiles were expressly so described (comp. Ps. lxxix. 6); here is described more generally the fundamental delinquency, ungodliness. It is further said: **and** *to those,* **who obey not the gospel,** &c.; the Lord Jesus has a right to claim obedience; faith is, after all, an affair of the will, the obedience of faith (Rom. i. 5; Acts vi. 7). The repetition of the article τοῖς in the second member appears to place the disobedient as a second class alongside the first; and so indeed many (GROTIUS, BENGEL, EWALD, LÜNEMANN, HOFMANN [JOWETT, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, WEBSTER and WILKINSON, &c.]) distinguish, finding here the two classes of persecutors who vexed the Thessalonians; *those who know not God* would be the heathen, *those who obey not the gospel* the Jews (comp. Rom. x.). But this same excessive strictness of historical reference

* [And so the Peschito Syriac, DRUSIUS, MICHAELIS, KOPPE, except that they connect the αὐτοῦ with ἀγγέλων.—J. L.]

* [So the Syriac, BEZA, and many others.—J. L.]

is not at all advisable; Paul speaks generally of the judgment of the world. Moreover, BENGEL himself says merely *Judæis maxime*, and HOFMANN also [ESTIUS, COCCEIUS, WHITBY, PEILE, *Revision*, &c.—J. L.] sees in the second class all who reject the gospel, whether heathens or Jews; in this we recognize the correct feeling, that to limit the second designation to the Jews is unjustifiable; but in that case the contrast is no longer clear, and there comes in the recollection of Christ's reproach to the Jews, that they know not God (John viii. 55; xv. 21; xvi. 3; they are wanting in the knowledge described in John xvii. 3); with which the Apostle's expressions are to be compared (Rom. iii. 11; x. 2; xi. 8 sqq.). On the whole, since the antithesis here is different from that in Rom. ii. 12, one looks for a condemnation at last only on account of the rejection of Christ, in which alienation from God culminates. The *οἵτινες* also of v. 9 comprehends in one the two seemingly different classes; so that we shall do better to find already in the eighth verse a description, not of two classes of men, but merely of the two poles of enmity against God: the fundamental aversion of men generally, and the consummation of their contumacy, when the opportunity of faith has been afforded them; so CALVIN [Bishop HALL], PELT, DE WETTE, OLSHAUSEN; the repetition of the *τοῖς* cannot force us to the opposite view,* if we compare Rom. iv. 12 [see also my *Revision* of Rev. xvi. 2, Note j. These two are much better examples than those which ELLICOTT cites, and objects to as questionable, viz. Matt. xxvii. 3; Luke xxii. 4.—J. L.]. Moreover, the *ἅγιοι* and the *πιστεύσαντες*, v. 10, are not two different classes (as BENGEL consistently would have it), but two parallel designations of the same persons. At any rate, we see here that the *θλίβοντες* of v. 6 come under the judgment, not as being merely human oppressors of men, but as enemies of God. [WORDSWORTH: *μή* implies that their ignorance and disobedience is the *cause* of their punishment.—J. L.]

5. (Vv. 9, 10.) **Who** [*οἵτινες, who, as such.*—J. L.] **shall suffer punishment**, &c.: properly *pay, discharge;* but the etymology disappears, as the opposition would otherwise be incongruous: (namely) **everlasting destruction**; *ὄλεθρος* we had at 1 Thess. v. 3; *ὀλέθριον* [LACHMANN] is given only by A.; this were an adjective to *δίκην*; but it is too feebly supported (the Sin. is also against it), and is unsuitable to *ἀπό*, &c., and to *δίκην* which already has an adjective [?]; the mistake was occasioned probably by *αἰώνιον*. The latter word might perhaps denote a long but still limited period; against this, however, is the parallel *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, Matt. xxv. 41, 46; therefore, without limits. OLSHAUSEN thinks that Paul has not another text of equally decided import; but, though he does not use this expression, he yet does say unconditionally: *βασιλείαν θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσι* (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10). The *ἀπό*, &c. is variously understood; CHRYSOSTOM, BENGEL, PELT, DE WETTE, EWALD, HOFMANN explain **from the face** as of the efficient cause (Acts iii. 19, where, however, it is connected with *ἐλθεῖν*); *προσώπου* would be not simply equivalent to *person*, but more expressive: *from His face*, which will be turned toward them in a threatening, penal, terrible manner; that mere look destroys them; CHRYSOSTOM: He needs but to appear, and they are punished; HOFMANN compares Jerem. iv. 26; Sept.* DE WETTE supposes that the second member especially: **from the glory of His power**, compels us to think of the efficient cause; but of that too an explanation may be found, that agrees still better with *δίκην τίσουσιν, ὄλεθρον αἰώνιον*, namely, as BEZA, LÜNEMANN [JOWETT, ALFORD, ELLICOTT], and others understand it, *away from*. OLSHAUSEN compares Is. ii. 10, 19, 21, Sept.: They will hide themselves, fleeing *ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ φόβου κυρίου καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ*, and finds in our text a breviloquence (as it were, *hiding themselves from*). But that is not at all necessary. We get the finest sense, and, as LÜNEMANN properly remarks, a real advance, and not still the same thing merely that was already implied *ἐν τῇ ἀποκ.*, when we understand it as *destruction* (*away*) *from the face of the Lord* (Jesus Christ); like *ἀνάθεμα ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ* (Rom. ix. 3); comp. *ἀπό* also in Rom. vii. 2; 2 Cor. xi. 3; Gal. v. 4.† This is destruction, to be separated from the blessed vision of His face, from the Source of light and life, from the influence of His gracious aspect; comp. Matt. vii. 23; *and from the glory* (the effulgence) *of His strength;* there is the less need of understanding this in DE WETTE's sense, that it is not said simply, *from His strength*, but from the *δόξα* of His strength. LÜNEMANN's explanation indeed: *from the glory which is the creation* [ALFORD: *visible localized result*] *of His power*, is somewhat far-fetched; the parallelism leads us rather to understand by that something belonging to the Lord Himself; comp. also the Hebrew הֲדַר גְּאֹנוֹ, Is. ii. 10; HOFMANN: *from His strength appearing in its glory;* DIEDRICH: the glory of His omnipotence, in its creation of a new heaven and a new earth, and in its entire communication of itself to the saved. And is not this a calamitous deprivation, to be separated from that glory of Christ's power, which will glorify man into the likeness of the Lord? (Phil. iii. 21); and so to remain without any share in that which follows in v. 10: **When He shall come**, more exactly, *shall have come* [ALFORD, ELLICOTT, WORDSWORTH]. And now the parallel members pour forth in the splendor of the prophetic strain, and bring the positive supplement to the *ἄνεσις* of v. 7. **To be glorified in His saints** does not mean simply to be praised by or amongst them in words, but to be actually shown to be glorious in the glory that He effects in them, by letting His glory appear in the glorification of His saints, by dwelling in them, and imparting Himself to them; see v. 12; John xvii. 10, 22 sqq.; Rom. ix. 23. And so it is taken also by most expositors. The saints here are certainly Christians, not angels; the latter, indeed, were particularly named in v. 7.

* [ELLICOTT, however, is of opinion that it renders that view "all but certain."—*Revision*: "I see no reason in the present case to waive the operation of the ordinary grammatical rule, especially as *ignorance of God* is frequently with Paul the specific characteristic of Gentilism; 1 Thess. iv. 5 (comp. Sept. Jer. x. 25); Acts xvii. 23, 30; Rom. i. 28; Gal. iv. 8; Eph. ii. 12, &c.; and it is, moreover, probable that the present (vv. 4, 5), no less than the previous (1 Thess. ii. 14; Acts xvii. 5, &c.), sufferings of this church had a double source, in the blind ungodliness of the heathen in general, and the special malignity of all such as resisted the grace of the gospel."—J. L.]

* [Comp. ch. ii. 8; Ex. xiv. 24; Ps. civ. 32; Hab. iii. 6. My *Revision* cites Shakespeare, *Julius Cæsar*, i. 3:

"Cæsar shall forth: the things that threaten'd me,
Ne'er look'd but on my back; when they shall see
The face of Cæsar, they are vanished."—J. L.]

† [Also Gen. iv. 16; Prov. xv. 29; Jer. xxxii. 31; Matt. xxii. 13; 1 John ii. 28 (in the Greek;—and see the other references in my *Revision* of that verse, Note a).—J. L.]

Nor does BENGEL succeed in proving, convincingly, that the believers are a different class from the saints; we rather recognize in this place merely the solemn parallelism of the members. But this does not exclude the climax implied in the πᾶσιν: in *all*, therefore also in you (vv. 4, 7). The *being admired* might be understood thus: *In the hearts of His believers He will create for Himself an admiring adoration;* but the parallel member leads rather to this explanation: *By that which He works in them He will show Himself wonderful;* He will become the wonder and admiration of creation (especially perhaps of the angels, comp. Eph. iii. 10), when it is revealed, what He has known to make of His believers. Thus it is taken already by CHRYSOSTOM: δι' ἐκείνων θαυμαστὸς ἀποδείκνυται; THEOPHYLACT [WEBSTER and WILKINSON] thinks, *in the presence of those who are now stiff-necked;* LÜNEMANN: The blessedness of believers being admired, Christ also is therein admired as the Author of that blessedness; comp. θαυμασθῆναι, Is. lxi. 6, Sept. It is worthy of note, how delicately one member of the statement answers to the other; the glory reveals what despised holiness is, and when it becomes manifest to what faith attains, that is a matter of wonder (HOFMANN).—**Because our testimony to you was believed;** μαρτύριον, equivalent to κήρυγμα, εὐαγγέλιον; ἐφ' ὑμᾶς belongs even without an article to μαρτ. (according to WINER, § 20. 2), *that directed toward you* (similarly Luke ix. 5); were it to be referred to ἐπιστεύθη, πρός must have been used.* BENGEL seems to take ὅτι as *that*, for he says: *motivum admirationis*, as if the clause supplied the subject of θαυμασθῆναι; whereas its subject is still the Lord. The words ὅτι to ὑμᾶς are already rightly regarded as a parenthesis by THEODORET and THEOPHYLACT, and then by ZWINGLI and CALVIN; ἐν τῇ ἡμ. ἐκ. goes back beyond that, but not, as BENGEL would have it, to the too remote ἔλθῃ [still less, as WEBSTER and WILKINSON would have it, to δίκην τίσουσιν.—J. L.], but to ἐνδοξ. and θαυμασθῆναι. Altogether untenable is LUTHER's translation: *Our testimony to you of that day ye believed;* as little does it answer to take ἐπιστεύθη for a future or (GROT.) a future perfect; to say nothing of other misinterpretations. The sense of the parenthesis with the verb put emphatically forward is this: *Since our testimony to you was believed, therefore I can speak of πιστεύσασιν in application also to you* (ὑμῖν, v. 7); *yes, you too belong to the believers;* he would fill them with the comfortable assurance: *Ye are of the number.* The addition of *in that day*, on the other hand, says: It will not happen till then; till then, patience! CALVIN: *fidelium vota cohibet, ne ultra modum festinent.* [Perhaps also the phrase, *in that day*, was intended strongly to suggest the thought, that the very same day, which brings terror and ruin to the ungodly and unbelievers, brings rest and glory to their former victims.—J. L.]—HOFMANN understands the passage otherwise; to avoid the parenthesis, he supposes that with ὅτι ἐπιστ. there is a new beginning; and that ἐν τῇ ἡμ. ἐκ. belongs to what follows, namely, to ἵνα ὑμᾶς ἀξιώσῃ, thus getting now in his turn εἰς ὅ to ὑμῶν for a parenthesis;—intolerably harsh! For though the position of ἐν τῇ ἡμ. ἐκ. before ἵνα might perhaps be justified by Acts xix. 4 and similar texts, yet to add to the inversion the parenthesis also is too much.

* [And then with the genitive, not, as here, the accusative.—J. L.]

6. (Vv. 11, 12.) **Darauf geht auch allezeit unser Beten fur euch (Thereunto tend also at all times our prayers for you)**; such was our German paraphrase; εἰς ὅ is not the same thing as δι' ὅ, *quapropter* (GROT.); it might mean, *in reference to which* (Rom. iv. 20; LÜNEMANN); but the final signification is to be preferred: *aiming at which, to which end* (Col. i. 29; DE WETTE [JOWETT, *Revision*, WEBSTER and WILKINSON, *Am. Bible Union*, &c.]), and the objection to this, that the certain truth of the purpose of grace (v. 10) would thus be made dependent on the Apostle's prayers, loses its force, so soon as we closely connect therewith περὶ ὑμῶν (*with this view do we pray for you*),* and further perceive that ἵνα, &c. merely carries out what εἰς ὅ at the forefront of the sentence indicates; † at 1 Thess. iii. 10 likewise the import of the prayer is expressed in the form of a design. BENGEL: *hoc orando nitimur;* that what was promised in v. 10 may fall also to your share. We *also* pray, he says; we too for our part, in harmony with the purpose of God. This we do besides giving thanks (v. 3). ‡—**That our God** (says he, with devout appropriation) **may count you worthy of the calling;** § GROTIUS, BENGEL, OLSHAUSEN, EWALD, and many understand it of *making worthy;* VON GERLACH: *that He may bestow on you the necessary qualities*, of which what follows would thus furnish the explanation. But ἀξιοῦν is always *to deem worthy, pronounce* [?] *worthy;* therefore: *that He may count you worthy of being adjudged the κλῆσις.* But were they not called long since? what should this still impending κλῆσις mean? One might think, as in the parable of the supper, of repeated calls: *that He may count you worthy of the last, decisive, energetic call, which brings you to the object;* or as HOFMANN says (and this might be separated from his distorted construction of our passage): *that He may count you worthy of a calling, which brings to completion what began with our testimony and your faith therein;* of the call δεῦτε (Matt. xxv. 34), to which already ZWINGLI refers. But we may also with LÜNEMANN (without regarding Phil. iii. 14, βραβεῖον τῆς κλήσεως, as quite parallel) understand κλῆσις as meaning *that to which you are called:* May He at last pronounce you worthy of that, the opposite of which might also, indeed, follow a want of fidelity; comp. ἐλπίς, of the thing hoped for, Col. i. 5. The difference, after all, is really unimportant; for he, who is finally thought worthy of the glory to which

* [It is, however, taken for granted throughout, that the Thessalonians were of the number of the saved; and therefore the ultimate answer to the objection is that given in my *Revision:* "It is no part whatever of Pauline philosophy, that the gracious and unalterable purpose of God vacates the prayers and efforts of faith. Only by means of these could Paul and his brethren aspire to be co-workers with God toward the predestined result. See 1 Cor. iii. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 1; Phil. ii. 12, 13, &c."—J. L.]

† [Not exactly so. Εἰς ὅ refers immediately to the future glorification of the Lord in His saints; ἵνα, &c. to the preparatory sanctification of the Thessalonians.—J. L.]

‡ [ALFORD: "*We pray also* (as well as wish)." ELLICOTT: "Besides merely longing or merely directing your hopes, we also avail ourselves of the definite accents of prayer, the καί gently contrasting the προσευχ. with the infusion of the hope and expectation involved in the preceding words, and especially echoed in the parenthetical member." *Lectures:* "As that (v. 10) was to be the result of the Advent in believers generally, so *also*, and with a view to the same consummation, Paul's continual request at the throne was, that the necessary preparatory work might be completed in the members of this particular church."—J. L.]

§ [τῆς κλήσεως;—not, *your calling* (PEILE, ALFORD, ELLICOTT). Comp. 3 John 7, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος.—J. L.]

Christians are called, is thought worthy also of the last invitation: *Come, then!* * The Apostle's prayer is directed, moreover, to this point (in order that the ἀξιοῦν may be realized): **that He may fulfil every desire of goodness,** &c.; ὑμᾶς does not belong to this clause, πληροῦν not governing two accusatives, but the meaning is, *in you.* If we disregard obviously false interpretations (GROTIUS: *your goodness, that is well-pleasing to Him;* similarly OLSHAUSEN and others), the only question is, whether with CALVIN, BENGEL, PELT, and others, we are to understand it thus: *that He may fulfil all the good pleasure of His goodness, ex parte Dei,* adds BENGEL, and, at the second member, *ex parte vestri.* But that is not well here; DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN, EWALD, HOFMANN properly hold that the second member, which denotes something wrought in the Thessalonians, compels us to understand the first also of ἀγαθωσύνη in the Thessalonians. Besides, Paul never uses this word of the Divine, but always of human goodness (Rom. xv. 14; Gal. v. 22; Eph. v. 9). And again, if God's goodness was to be spoken of, we must necessarily have had πᾶσαν τὴν εὐδ., and αὐτοῦ after it. The correct view, therefore, is: *that He may bring* (in you) *to fulfilment every good pleasure in, every inclination to, goodness* [so ALFORD, ELLICOTT, WEBSTER and WILKINSON: "better, grace *in* them than *towards* them," &c. ALFORD errs, however, in making ἀγαθωσύνης a gen. of apposition.—J. L.]. God must fulfil this; otherwise we are prone to evil; εὐδοκία of the human disposition we find also at Rom. x. 1. Delight in what is good is partly the first preparation for faith (John vii. 17), and partly its fruit. But here the Apostle speaks, not merely of the furtherance of this disposition, but of its fulfilment. Thus we are not to think simply of a growing sanctification, nor, as regards **the work of faith,** simply, with CHRYSOSTOM, THEODORET, THEOPHYLACT, of the endurance of persecutions; but Paul has his eye on the final mark. On ἔργον πίστεως, comp. the exegetical explanation of 1 Thess. i. 3; for the completion and slight modification of that let it merely be added, that for the right understanding of that text it seems to us indispensable, 1. to take the three genitives in the same way, and 2. to avoid every interpretation, by which one member of the statement would be confounded with another. It is very clear that the κόπος τῆς ἀγάπης is there the toil and labor springing from love, befitting love. This must guide us also in the first member; ἔργον τῆς πίστεως is the work springing from faith, befitting faith; not, however, the moral authentication of faith outwardly, which would encroach on the second or third member, but the fundamental inward work of faith in the soul; not the sum of the works which spring from faith, but that which is presupposed as the foundation of all moral activity, to wit, the primary act of breaking loose from self-confidence, and casting one's self entirely on the living God. Instead of Gal. v. 6, the text for comparison is rather Rom. iv. 20, 21.

* [ELLICOTT: "κλῆσις, though really the initial act (comp. 1 Thess. ii. 12), includes the Christian course which follows (Eph. iv. 1), and its issues in blessedness hereafter." See *Revision* and *Lectures.* I am still inclined to refer ἵνα ὑμᾶς ἀξιώσῃ τῆς κλήσεως to God's final judgment on the Thessalonians as *having walked worthy of their vocation* (ἀξίως τῆς κλήσεως ἧς ἐκλήθητε, Eph. iv. 1. Comp. the invariable New Testament use of ἀξίως, as in 1 Thess. ii. 12, and the import of ἄξιος in Matt. iii. 8; Luke iii. 8; Acts xxvi. 20). But as those whom God counts worthy He first makes worthy, the rest of the verse describes this preparatory process.—J. L.]

This energetic groundwork of faith Paul sees existing in the Thessalonians; he notes it in 1 Thess. i. 9, whereas here his prayer for them is that God may fully accomplish it, and through faith bring to perfection the new man; ἐν δυνάμει, **in power,** *with force* (1 Thess. i. 5); LÜNEMANN: *powerfully; res ardua,* says CALVIN. It belongs to πληρώσῃ.—**That the name of our Lord Jesus,** &c. Compared with v. 10, this word indicates that to Himself we can bring no glory, but His name is glorified in us, and we personally in Him. Yet is His (and in general the Divine) name itself something real, as is expressly shown by the present context, which in v. 12 asserts of the name what v. 10 says of Christ Himself. *Hallowed be Thy name;* in the name of Jesus we pray, and in the name of God the Father, &c. we are baptized; comp. Ex. xxiii. 31; Deut. xxvi. 2; 1 Kings viii. 29; Jer. xxxii. 20; Ps. xlviii. 11 [10]. What His name is in fact He Himself makes for Himself; it is not a name given by mere human invention and conception. He reveals Himself as he would be recognized and invoked, as He who is what He is called, and is effectively present wherever called upon. His name is glorified in us; and therefore this does not mean merely, that He is celebrated in the praises of our lips, but (as the second member shows) that He is in fact made glorious, when the Lord shows Himself in us true to His name, as the prayer-answering Saviour; when He prevails with us to have His name named upon us, as those who really belong to Him (Deut. xxviii. 10; Am. ix. 12; James ii. 7.)—**And ye in Him,** that is, may be glorified; a reciprocity, as in John xvii. Most understand this as *in Him, the Lord;* LÜNEMANN, HOFMANN: *in it, the name.* As regards the meaning, the difference is unessential. This word likewise looks to the consummation; living in the Lord, we are to be made partakers of His glorified nature; in the name of the Lord: the power of that name, which is above every name. And all this, **according to the grace of our God and Lord Jesus Christ.** He thus quenches all human pride. Since the article stands before θεοῦ, and not before κυρίου, it is altogether most natural, with HOFMANN, to refer θεοῦ also to Christ [but see Critical Note 13.—J. L.], without this being, as HILGENFELD supposes (p. 264), a mark of spuriousness; for not merely Tit. ii. 13, but also Rom. ix. 5 speaks of Christ in loftier terms than are agreeable to our modern critics (comp. John xx. 28; 2 Pet. i. 1, 11). The distinction between God and Christ is not to be sustained by an appeal to texts like vv. 1 and 2, since there the article is wanting also before θεῷ and θεοῦ.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. (V. 3.) It is important for all life, that it also grow; otherwise it stands still, or rather retrogrades. But growth in the kingdom of grace proceeds in part differently from what it does in the kingdom of nature. Even a tree, indeed, must grow as well below as above. But still more does that saying of STARKE hold good of the Christian life: This growth takes place either openly and sensibly, when a man, after experiencing the sorrows of repentance, is sensibly comforted and quieted in his soul (Ps. ciii. 1–5); or it takes place in a secret, concealed, hidden manner in circumstances of trial, when a man perhaps makes the most powerful advance, but God does not yet allow Him to be clearly and properly sensible of it

—Still more important is another distinction, to wit, that every being in nature, even every man and every people, reaches on the natural side a highest point, and then declines and goes toward death, whereas by Christ and His Holy Spirit is implanted in the individual and in humanity a germ of imperishable life, that does not decay, but ripens to perfection (v. 11), and is just then most powerfully matured, when tribulation even to death wastes the outer man.

[Burkitt: As it is our duty, it will be our great wisdom and prudence, so to speak of the graces of God which we see and observe in others, as that they may not be puffed up with any conceit of their own excellencies, but see matter of praise and thanksgiving due unto God only, and nothing to themselves.—M. Henry: We may be tempted to think that, though when we were bad we could not make ourselves good, yet when we are good we can easily make ourselves better; but we have as much dependence on the grace of God for the increasing the grace we have, as for the planting of grace when we had it not.—J. L.]

2. (V. 4.) Are we at liberty even to glory in men? Not so as to foster our own ambition, or to flatter the ambition of others. Nor is all danger obviated by saying, that we extol God's work in them; the old man seeks to catch his share also therein. Where faith is really put to the trial of patience (James i. 2–5), there is the least risk of pride, and in such a trial there is incentive for others. They, who are commended, are not allowed by God to want for secret checks. For them *too* that word holds good: *noblesse oblige*.

3. (V. 5.) God's rule is a constant righteous judging and sifting with a gracious purpose; for righteousness stands in the service of grace; grace reigns through righteousness (Rom. v. 21). But it is not always easy even for faith to keep track of this. Not merely are wilful, impatient persons offended, that it often seems to go ill with the good, and so well with the wicked; not merely do the frivolous and faint-hearted ask, Where is now the righteous God? but even Asaph had well-nigh slipped here. It is the triumph of faith, when it lays hold of the Apostle's word, and in that very thing, which seems to conflict with all righteousness, learns to recognize the working out of righteous judgment. On one side it is a terribly earnest declaration of it, when God punishes sinners by giving them up to sin (Rom. i. 24 sqq.; ix. 17; xi. 8 sqq., 32); the Christian likewise may be sensibly visited with chastisement, and it is hard to stand beneath the judgment of God; nevertheless, in the severity itself there is comfort, since it lifts us above dependence on men. And to him, who yields to the humiliation, there is the further help vouchsafed, that his faith is strengthened in the impossibility of the righteous God allowing confidence in His promise to come to shame; and still more, *in* the very confusions of time he perceives evidence of the righteous judgment of God, which in sending afflictions and persecutions, in hardening the ungodly, in the chastisement and purification of the pious, in their separation from the world, and in their confirmation to a believing constancy, accomplishes itself from day to day, till in the final consummation (v. 6 sqq.) it reaches the end of righteous retribution. Until then the account is still open; then comes the settlement.

4. Rieger: A man becomes meet for the kingdom of God under suffering; not as if by suffering he could deserve it. For truly our affliction is not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us (Rom. viii. 18). The mercy of God in Christ alone makes us meet for this inheritance (Col. i. 12). But God's plan and order is, to try man's intrinsic worth and value by their endurance in the fire of affliction, and whether they are possessed by a paramount delight in the invisible and eternal, or by an irredeemable tendency to vanity (2 Cor. iv. 17, 18). The heirs of the kingdom must earn for themselves the witness, that they love not their lives unto the death (Rev. xii. 11). In the judgment of the world, it is true, they suffer as evildoers, as wilful, unmanageable people; but the testimony of God in a good conscience bids them rejoice, and leap for joy, and glory in tribulation, because they suffer for the kingdom of God (Luke vi. 23; 1 Pet. iv. 13; Rom. v. 3; comp. Rev. vi. 10 sq.; vii. 14; xi. 18).—We add, that a man cannot claim the reward, as if he had first given something to God (Rom. xi. 35); but when God has trained, proved, and tested a man, like gold in the fire, He crowns in him His own grace, and gives him the reward of his fidelity.

[*Lectures:* "That ye may be counted worthy, &c.;—if indeed it is a righteous thing, &c." In using such expressions—and there are very many of them in the New Testament—the inspired writers proceed upon the ground of that gracious covenant, in which, through their union with Chrst, believers stand, and whose merciful provisions, on God's part absolutely sovereign and free, alone give them all the claim they have on the Divine favor here or hereafter. But that claim, though thus originating, and because thus originating, is an infinitely and eternally valid claim. It is deep and abiding, as the love of the Father for the Son; strong and sure, as the word and oath of Him who cannot lie—cannot deny Himself—or frustrate any hope which He himself has raised. In this respect, as in many others, the gospel salvation reveals God's righteousness no less than it does His love.—J. L.]

5. (Vv. 6, 7.) The *jus talionis*, "eye for eye, tooth for tooth," or, "with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again," would be improperly described as a human right of retaliation. It is rather just the inviolable Divine order, though in a sensible, allegorical form. Jesus Himself does not in Matt. v. 38 sqq. reject the principle (comp. Matt. vii. 2), but merely the arbitrary Pharisaic abuse of it. A Divine order it remains, and as such is engraven on the human conscience, that guilt shall recoil on the head of the perpetrator. However much and however long justice may lie oppressed amongst men, with God it stands unshaken. All God's long-suffering does not annul the fact, that His proceedings tend in the long run to a perfect retribution. For this reason even the purpose of God's grace is not accomplished by means of an amnesty setting justice aside, but through the satisfaction of justice by an adequate atonement. Whoever rejects this, draws upon himself the final judgment; whoever in the sense of a living, penitent faith acquiesces in the economy of redemption, in that man the righteousness of God can work out salvation (1 John i. 9; Rom. iii. 26). On the wrath of God, comp. the *Apologet. Beiträge* by Gess and Riggenbach, p. 89 sqq.—[Barnes: If it is *right* that the sinner should be punished, *it will be done.*—J. L.]

6. The eschatological excitement in Thessalonica,

though it was known to the Apostle, does not at all hinder him from discussing these great truths. An abuse does not abrogate the proper use. And it is true that he speaks on the subject for the very express purpose of comforting those under persecution. But neither does he fail also to follow this up in ch. ii. with the needful sedatives. One chief mark of Scripture as originating with the Spirit of God is, that both in the teaching of doctrine and in the regulation of the life it speaks with so great depth and force, and yet at the same time also with so great moderation; never one-sidedly either in the way of exaggerating or in that of suppressing any truth. It is to be observed, moreover, that this expectation of rest at the return of Christ stands in distinct contradiction to the Irvingite doctrine of the translation; see the Doctrinal and Ethical Note on 1 Thess. iv. 17.*

7. (Vv. 6–9.) But how should the prospect of the perdition of the ungodly serve to comfort the pious? This seems to savor of a malignant joy, or at least to express a strange longing for vengeance. To wait for the judgment of God, however, is something different from avenging ourselves (1 Pet. ii. 23). And the former should as little be wanting in the children of God, as God ever ceases to be holy. The oppressors spoken of here, as so often in the Psalms, are not at all opponents on trifling grounds of human quarrel, but they hate God's servants and children, because they hate God's truth. In our text v. 8 especially shows that those are meant to whom salvation was offered, but they have trifled away their hour of grace. Respecting the violence and scorn of the ungodly the living sentiment of justice now cries to God. On this point no man can judge, who has no inward experience of zeal for God's glory. Paul testifies with joyful faith, that now already the righteous judgment of God rules, but withal he holds fast, as a postulate, the final, complete separation between the pious and the ungodly, as in Mal. iii. 18. Scripture generally is far from any abstract, idealistic surrender of the final and absolute triumph of the cause of God. If then we think of the Apostle's fervent longing to be made a curse for his brethren (Rom. ix. 3), if they could thereby be helped, we shall give up entirely talking about vindictiveness. Yet how few have experienced the vehement desire, that right shall still be right, and God continue to be God, which must arise in a soul compelled to endure the harshest abuse and oppression of its faith! We need not wish to be more merciful than the eternal Mercy (Matt. vii. 14). There is a point, at which the flaming majesty of the holiness of God advances in power against the obdurate despisers of His grace. Nevertheless, the love of enemies remains in force (1 Thess. v. 15), so long as there is still anything to be hoped for. CALVIN's admonition is, that, although Paul promises vengeance, yet we are not to wish for it against any man. It is quite possible that the honor of God's cause, and the salvation of those exposed to seduction, might impel an Apostle to call down a sharp judgment on the adversaries (1 Cor. v. 5; Acts xiii. 10, 11); but the design always is, wherever it is still possible, correction in order to salvation; and human violence is never allowed to interfere (Matt. xiii. 29. *Give place unto wrath* (Rom. xii. 19), that is, to the wrath of God; where that is kindled, it becomes man, in the fulness of awe, and also of humble submission, as well as of sympathy towards those who are judged, to stand aside. There thus exists a fundamental likeness between the piety of the Old Testament and that of the New. The difference does not consist in the setting aside in the New Testament of the threatenings of judgment, but only in this, that in Christ's redemptive work there is revealed an inconceivably larger grace than the Old Testament gave occasion to expect, whereby the uttermost is done to render possible a deliverance from judgment. While the revelation before Christ was to be altogether true—wholly that, and nothing more than that, which humanity before Christ was able to bear—yet, with all the glory of the words of grace even in the Old Testament, it was still impossible that the fulness of mercy should be made known as it was by Christ in word and deed. Comp. the essay on *die Nächstenliebe*, *Stud. und Krit.*, 1856, p. 117 sqq.

8. On *not knowing God*, see the Doctrinal and Ethical Note on 1 Thess. iv. 5. The heathen also are guilty, when they do not even *inquire* after God; but there are still many amongst them, who, for their own part, are at least in some measure excused by the general degradation. This is recognized in the words of the Lord respecting Tyre and Sidon, Sodom and Gomorrah (Matt. x. 15; xi. 22, 24). The consummation of guilt is, when the original stupidity towards God develops itself into conscious rejection of His gracious counsel and work; and here again also blasphemy against the Holy Ghost marks the highest point. "Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father" (1 John ii. 23); this word is receiving an ever-growing fulfilment in our day. It is possible for one to pray to a God who yet is rather sought than known. But wherever Jesus, the highest revelation of the true God, is not merely still unknown, but is denied and rejected, there at last nothing more is retained than a power of nature, to which it is impossible to pray as to a Father. But as the denial of Jesus betrays the repugnance of the heart, so faith is a matter of the will. In the former case, the meaning is: *So thou sayest, but I will not*, and thus God is made a liar (1 John i. 10); here the Apostle speaks of the obedience of faith. For this very reason the principle stands firm also with Paul, that a man is judged according to his deeds (Rom. ii. 6–11; 2 Cor. v. 10). But the innermost soul of right conduct is obedience to the command for the reception of grace; and that is just faith.

9. Holy Scripture knows nothing of the entire renunciation of all motives of fear and hope, such as is required by philosophic morality; nor is it known in actual life. Even the dullest indifferentism, even the haughtiest self-consciousness, cannot fully extinguish fear and hope; nor should it. The only point of importance is, that the living God become their object.

10. The eternity of punishment is to many a peculiar offence. But let us not forget that only those are threatened with this (especially in Matt. xii. 31, 32), on whom the merciful God, Father, Son, and Spirit, has brought to bear His entire work of grace, and has done so in vain.* Through obdurate

* [I am not aware of any sufficient scriptural evidence of the doctrine referred to. But just as little, so far as I can see, is it contradicted by our text.—J. L.]

* [This seems to mean that none are in danger of eternal punishment but blasphemers of the Holy Ghost. Believing this doctrine to be thoroughly unscriptural, I shall be allowed here simply to express my firm dissent.—J. L.]

resistance to grace the state of inward desolation must have reached such a pass, that from a man in this condition even his neighbors necessarily become detached; whereas on the other hand we cannot think highly enough of the resources of the grace of God. Now since the grace of God Himself, being more fervent than a mother's love, cannot forget, and therefore cannot, it would appear, cease to love, how is it possible that it should perpetuate the life of the damned, merely to subject them to perpetual torment? In the line of these thoughts we reach various attempts to set bounds to the eternity of the punishments of hell. The most obvious device still would be to take αἰώνιος in a limited sense; but the inference on the side of life [Matt. xxv. 46] would scarcely be accepted. It must be allowed that, where we have to deal with first principles and final issues, we are least capable of viewing things as God Himself views them, and therefore also are least entitled to lay down definite doctrines transcending the rule of Scripture. Comp. *Apolog. Beiträge*, p. 239 sqq. [On the subject of this paragraph, see *Lectures on Thessalonians*, pp. 454–460.—J. L.]

11. (Vv. 10–12.) Who can form to himself a sufficiently lofty conception of that glory, when the Lord shall glorify His own in soul and body—shall disclose to all the world their previously unknown inward blessedness and sanctifying forces—shall manifest them as the Temple of God, as His friends and children, and introduce them to His everlasting joy (*Calwer Handbuch der Bibelerklärung*)! What amazement will it then awaken, to see this mighty body (of which Christ is the Head), grown up from the small seed-corn of faith, and now standing there perfect in its beauty through the union of all its members with the Head (Von Gerlach)!

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

V. 3. Beginning and progress—both come from God; even growth therefore is no merit of ours.—Heubner: As the individual, so likewise the Church must be constantly on the increase.—Calvin: How disgraceful is our sluggishness, that we scarcely in a long while advance a foot!—The same: We owe God thanks also for the good that He does to our brethren. So dear to us should be the salvation of our brethren, that whatever is given them we should regard as our own good. The welfare of every member tends to promote the prosperity of the whole Church.—Paul seeks to keep all the churches bound to one another in cordial sympathy.—*Berl. Bib.:* In the growth of love consists the greatest beauty of a church.—Theophylact (after Chrysostom): We should not love one, and another not; partial love is not love, but the cause of quarrels.—The same: It is not tears and lamentations that our sufferings deserve, but thanksgiving.—[Bishop Wilson: If love abounds, faith also increaseth. This is a test.—J. L.]

V. 4. Heubner: Temptations verify faith; by persecution is Christianity sealed.—Stähelin: The fairest growth of faith, love, and experience flourishes on the stem of the cross.—In such circumstances a mere notion does not hold its ground.—Chrysostom: Where love and faith are weak, they are shaken by affliction; where they are strong, they become thereby still stronger.—How is it that in distress faith grows? and how love?

V. 5. To what degree is the patient endurance of persecution proof of the righteous judgment?—When things go well with the ungodly, the carnal mind says: There is no judgment.—Heubner: That which now appears to conflict with the Divine righteousness is for faith a confirmation of it. It is shown that God saves those only who are proved and sorely tried. Thy sufferings are necessary for the justification and glorification of the righteousness of God. Thou art thereby to appear as one worthy of salvation.—*Berl. Bib.:* Satan must not say: Christians do well to be pious; they are not allowed to suffer.—Stockmeyer: When it is said: Where is now the righteous God? why does He not own us? understand that, in enduring with patience and faith, thou hast already experienced a palpable demonstration of the righteousness of God.—The same: From the glorious end light is reflected on the darkest experiences, wherein, however, the righteousness of God even already wrought, to make thee by means of thy unjust suffering gradually worthy of salvation.—Starke: There is such a thing as the holy vengeance of God; Antiochus, Herod, Nero experienced it.—Heubner: To vex, afflict, oppress a man that loves God, and is loved by God, is in God's eyes one of the most heinous offences.—Chrysostom: We would not vindictively rejoice over the punishment of others, but over our own deliverance from such punishment and torment.—God will assign to every one the position suitable to his inward state.—*Berl. Bib.:* The inward and outward and external will there be mutually reconciled.

V. 7. There is such a thing as coming out of great tribulation, a Sabbath rest, a blessed liberty of the children of God.—Heubner: Like faith, like trial, like reward.—Calvin: Much greater deference is given to those who have had long practice in that which they teach; Paul does not stand in the shade, and bid the Thessalonians fight in the sun.—Heubner: The angels have power to execute the judgments of God; the mightiest villain is powerless against them; one glance of an angel smites him to the earth.

V. 8. Chrysostom: By saying nothing about hell, wilt thou thus extinguish it?—The same: No one who keeps hell in view, will fall into hell.—The same: It is a great evil, to despise threatenings.—Theophylact: If those are condemned, who do not obey the gospel, how much more those who prevent the obedience of others!

V. 9. Mark that terribly serious word, *everlasting*.—Rieger: To appear before Jesus, and to be unable to stand in the presence of His glorious power, will be just as intolerable for the ungodly as their punishment itself; even as the trial and court-day are often felt more keenly than the penalty.—Heubner: To be banished from the face of Christ is more than all torture.

V. 10. [Leighton: *Glorified in His saints*, &c.;—how much more in the matchless brightness of His own glorious person!—J. L.]—Stockmeyer: It will one day be manifest, that sanctification is glorification; at present many dread it as being the death of the old man.—Roos: Every one will wonder that from an insignificant root (faith) has sprung the splendid flower of glory, or that faith in the preached gospel should have drawn after it such glorious results.—The same: That Christ should be glorified and admired in the saints requires that they too have glorified bodies, and appear with Christ (Col. iii. 4).—Stockmeyer: Many will be surprised, when too

late, that many things which they pronounced impossible have yet come to pass.—[Lardner: The wisdom, power, and faithfulness of Christ, glorified in the perfect holiness, external glory, and great number, of His people.—J. L.]

V. 3–10 is one of the Epistles for the 26th Sunday after Trinity (or else for the 27th). It proclaims to us the righteousness of Divine retribution, 1. as consolation for oppressed Christians, who are growing in faith and love: a. already in the midst of their affliction let them recognize the holy rule of the righteousness of God; b. let them confidently expect, in the day of revelation, not merely rest from their labor, but glorification; 2. as a serious warning for the adversaries, who are not merely a. driven now already from one degree to another of hostility to God, but are also, b. drawing upon themselves everlasting destruction; nor can they charge this on the gospel, but solely on their disobedience to it.

V. 11. Stockmeyer: Whoever is able to suffer for the cause of God, so long as it is still despised and assailed, is worthy also to rejoice with it, when it comes to honor.

V. 12. Heubner: Jesus is best glorified, and the honor of His name vindicated, in the life of Christians. Were this apology furnished by Christians, no written one would be needed, and their slanderers would be struck dumb.

Vv. 11, 12. Stockmeyer: In this section are two things deserving of all consideration: 1. that the Apostle feels himself impelled, even for such a Christian church as that was, still to make continual intercession; and 2. what it is that he asks for them. 1. The Apostles and Christ Himself lay great stress on intercessory prayer, whether it be the pouring forth of our heart's sorrow for such as are still to us the occasion of sorrow, or whether it is because we reflect on how much is involved in a man's persevering to the end in the right way. Of course, intercession is not a kind of convenient makeweight for laziness, which likes to do nothnig otherwise; but it seeks the blessing of God, without which we can do nothing. 2. The matter of the intercession is, that God would bring them to a point where He can count them worthy of the heavenly calling in its entire length and breadth; and, for this purpose, that He would grant them grace to remain faithful and obedient to the call to holiness. Thus will be fulfilled the saying: "I am thine, thou art mine."

II.

Instruction and Exhortation in regard to the antichristian consummation of evil.

1. Ch. II. 1–12.

The warning, against allowing themselves to be easily misled into the notion of the day of the Lord being at the door (vv. 1, 2), is confirmed by reminding them that, as he had already told them orally, the Man of Sin must previously be revealed (vv. 3–5), that the mystery of lawlessness is still for the present restrained by an obstructive power, and will only reach its height when this is removed, and will then also come to its end by the appearing of the Lord (vv. 6–8); of what sort the lying power of the enemy will be, is then more exactly described.

1 Now [But][1] we beseech you, brethren, by [concerning, ὑπέρ] the coming of
our Lord Jesus Christ, and *by* our [and our] gathering together unto Him,
2 that ye be not soon [quickly][2] shaken in mind [from your mind],[3] or [nor yet][4]
be troubled [alarmed],[5] neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from
3 [by, διά] us, as that the day of Christ [the Lord][6] is at hand [is present].[7] Let
no man [no one, μή τις] deceive you by any means [in any way]:[8] for [because,
ὅτι] *that day shall not come*, except there come a falling away [the apostasy,
ἡ ἀποστασία] first, and that [the, ὁ] man of sin[9] be revealed, the son of perdition,
4 who opposeth, and exalteth himself above [against][10] all that is called God or
that is worshipped [every one called God or an object of worship],[11] so that he
as God[12] sitteth [sitteth down, καθίσαι] in the temple of God, showing himself
5 [showing himself forth][13] that he is God. Remember ye not that, when I was
6 yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth,
7 that he might be revealed [may be rev.][14] in his [his own][15] time. For the
mystery of iniquity doth already work [For the m. is already working of lawlessness],[16] only he who now letteth *will let*, until he [only until he, who with-
8 holdeth for the present,][17] be taken out of the way; and then shall that Wicked
be revealed [shall be rev. the lawless one],[18] whom the Lord [Lord Jesus][19] shall
consume with the spirit [breath][20] of His mouth, and shall destroy with the
9 brightness [appearing][21] of His coming: *even him*, whose coming is after
[according to][22] the working of Satan, with [in, ἐν] all power and signs and
10 lying wonders [wonders of falsehood],[23] and with [in, ἐν] all deceivableness
[deceitfulness, ἀπάτῃ] of unrighteousness in them that perish [for those who are

perishing];[24] because they received [accepted][25] not the love of the truth, that
11 they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send [doth God send][26]
them strong delusion [a working of delusion, *ἐνέργειαν πλάνης*], that they should
12 believe a lie [the falsehood, *τῷ ψεύδει*]; that they all[27] might be damned [may
be judged][28] who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in[29] unrighteousness.

[1] V. 1.—[*Revision*: "'You see, then, what is to be expected, and prayed for, as your portion at the coming of the Lord. *But*, in regard to that coming itself, &c.' Or perhaps the Greek arrangement may rather suggest an opposition between *ἐρωτῶμεν ὑμᾶς* here and *προσευχόμεθα περὶ ὑμῶν* of ch. i. 11." The latter is Riggenbach's idea; whereas Webster and Wilkinson thus: "Such is our hope and consolation, *but* because it is such, by every consideration connected with the great fact which gives it its character, I beg of you, &c."—J. L.]

[2] V. 2.—[*ταχέως*; immediately on being thus tempted. Comp. E. V., Luke xiv. 21; xvi. 6.—J. L.]

[3] V. 2.—[*ἀπὸ τοῦ νοός*; rendered as above, *from your mind*, in several of the older versions (Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva, Bishops), and recently by Starke, Jowett, Wordsworth, Alford. Ellicott: *from your sober mind;* Riggenbach: *vom vernünftigen Sinn*.—J. L.]

[4] V. 2.—The best copies [including Sin., and Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth, Ellicott, &c.] give *μηδέ*, which is also the proper particle, and then *μήτε* three times. Comp. Winer, § 55. 6.

[5] V. 2.—[*θροεῖσθαι*, a stronger word than *σαλευθῆναι*. Such equivalents as *terrified, dismayed, perterreri, erschrecken*, &c., are given for it in the versions.—J. L.]

[6] V. 2.—Instead of the *Rec.* *Χριστοῦ*, which has few authorities, the most and the best (also Sin.) give *κυρίου* [and so all the recent editions.—J. L.]

[7] V. 2.—[*ἐνέστηκεν*; Riggenbach, after Luther, *vorhanden wäre*. On this word, see an elaborate note in *Revision*.—J. L.]

[8] V. 3.—[*κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον*; comp. E. V., Rom. iii. 2; Phil. i. 8.—J. L.]

[9] V. 3.—Instead of *ἁμαρτίας*, which, however, has many old authorities, and amongst others Or. 5, in its favor, B., Sin., and some other Alexandrian sources give *ἀνομίας*, arising probably from vv. 7, 8.

[10] V. 4.—[*ἐπί* with the accusative. Ellicott, in the Commentary: *above (and against)*; in the *Revision: against;* and so Wordsworth, and recent English translators generally, and the Am. Bible Union, &c.—J. L.]

[11] V. 4.—[*πάντα λεγόμενον θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα*. *Revision*: "E. V. and the older English versions apparently follow the Vulg. *omne quod* = *πᾶν τό*, which however, I find in no printed text but that of Beza, and there it is avowedly for no reason except that Jerome might seem to have read it, and that in Beza's own opinion it yields a richer sense: *mihi tamen uberius videtur*." Riggenbach, likewise, retains Luther's *über alles das*. But very many from Faber to Alford and Wordsworth have preferred the masculine construction.—J. L.]

[12] V. 4.—The *ὡς θεόν* before *καθίσαι* in the Elzevir is brought under suspicion as a gloss by A. B. D.[1] Sin., most of the versions, and the oldest Fathers. [It is condemned by Mill, and cancelled by the majority of critical editors. Riggenbach likewise omits it.—J. L.]

[13] V. 4.—[*ἀποδεικνύντα*. Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 9. Here, for the Vulgate *ostendens*, Augustine and others use *ostentare*. Ellicott: *exhibiting, displaying;* Wordsworth, as above.—J. L.]

[14] V. 6.—[*εἰς τὸ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι*; comp. 1 Thess. iii. 10.—J. L.]

[15] V. 6.—[*τῷ ἑαυτοῦ*; the time assigned to him—then, and not sooner.—Sin.[1] A. K.: *τῷ αὐτοῦ*.—J. L.]

[16] V. 7.—[*τὸ γὰρ μυστήριον ἤδη ἐνεργεῖται τῆς ἀνομίας*. The emphasis of *τὸ μυστήριον*, as opposed to the double *ἀποκαλυφθῆναι* of vv. 7, 8, is strengthened by the Greek order.—J. L.]

[17] V. 7.—[*μόνον ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι ἕως, κ.τ.λ.* See the Exegetical Note 3.—J. L.]

[18] V. 8.—[*ἀποκαλυφθήσεται ὁ ἄνομος*. Here again the revelation, as being now the main idea, is put foremost.—J. L.]

[19] V. 8.—*Ἰησοῦς* is supported by Sin. A. D.[1] E[1] F. G. L.[2], and most of the Versions and Fathers [and nearly all the critical editors.—J. L.]; it is wanting in B. D.[3] E.[2] K. L.[1], and most of the minuscules.—The variation *ἀνελεῖ* (from Is. xi. 4, Sept. ?), for *ἀναλώσει*, makes no change in the sense; if Sin. *a prima manu* gives *αναλοι* [Sin.[2]: *ανελοι*] that is a corruption, holding the middle between the two readings.

[20] V. 8.—[*πνεύματι*. Comp. the English version of Is. xi. 4; and so very many here, including the Am. Bible Union.—J. L.]

[21] V. 8.—[*ἐπιφανείᾳ*. This word occurs six times in the New Testament—once, in reference to the Lord's first coming; five times, in reference to His second—and is always elsewhere rendered in our Version, *appearing*. In the present instance E. V. follows the Bishop's Bible. Alford and Ellicott have *appearance*, after Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva; Wordsworth, Webster and Wilkinson, Am. Bible Union: *manifestation*.—J. L.]

[22] V. 9.—[*κατά*. Comp. Eph. i. 19; iii. 20; &c.—J. L.]

[23] V. 9.—[*τέρασι ψεύδους*. The genitive belongs to all the three nouns.—J. L.]

[24] V. 10.—The authorities [including Sin.[1]] preponderate for the simple dative, whereas the *Rec.* prefixes *ἐν*.—[*τῆς* before *ἀδικίας* is wanting in Sin.[1] A. B. F. G., Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth, Ellicott.—J. L.]

[25] V. 10.—[*ἐδέξαντο*. See 1 Thess. ii. 13, Exeg. Note 2.—J. L.]

[26] V. 11.—The present *πέμπει* [Scholz, Schott, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Theile, Alford, Wordsworth, Ellicott.—J. L.] deserves the preference over the future *πέμψει*. Here, as in the previous instance [v. 8], Sin. *a prima manu* goes with the oldest authorities; the correction by a later hand, with the Elzevir.

[27] V. 12.—For *ἅπαντες* (all together), are Sin. A. F. G. [Tischendorf, Alford]; for *πάντες*, B. D. E. L. The former is to be preferred as the rarer. [According to the American edition of Ellicott, there is in regard to the reading here an instance of the too frequent discrepancy between the Commentary and the Translation.—J. L.]

[28] V. 12.—[*κριθῶσι*. *Revision*: "Out of 113 instances E. V. makes *κρίνω* = *κατακρίνω* only in 7, including Rev. xviii. 20 (where see *Revision*, Note k); the others being John iii. 17, 18 (twice); Acts xiii. 27; Rom. xiv. 22."—For *may*, comp. 1 Thess. ii. 16.—J. L.]

[29] V. 12.—*ἐν* is given by the Codd. A. D.[3] E. K. L. and Sin. *a secunda manu*; it is omitted (probably to conform it to *τῇ ἀληθ.*) by B. D.[1] F. G. and Sin. *a prima manu*. [Lachmann brackets it.—J. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. (Vv. 1, 2.) **But we beseech you, &c.**; as in 1 Thess. iv. 1; v. 12; over against the prayer of ch. i. 11,* 12 he now turns to his brethren; **on account of, in regard to the coming,** *ὑπέρ*, as in ch. i. 4; Rom. ix. 27; not an adjuration, *per*, as you dread or desire that day (so ZWINGLI, CALVIN, and others); but this use of the preposition does not belong to the New Testament; LÜNEMANN, too artificially: *in the interest of the coming* [JOWETT and WORDSWORTH: *on behalf of;* the former adding: "as though he were pleading in honor of that day, that the expectation of it might not be a source of disorder in the Church."—J. L.], to obviate all mistakes on that subject; but certainly the coming itself has no such interest.* He is speaking, as in

* [ALFORD and ELLICOTT partially adopt LÜNEMANN'S suggestion. I should rather say that *ὑπέρ* here, instead of *περί*, carries with it an indication of the strong personal interest felt by the writer and his readers in their Lord's coming. So GREEN, who refers also to Acts v. 41; Rom. ix. 29; 2 Cor. v. 12; viii. 23; &c.; WEBSTER and WILKINSON.—J. L.]

v. 8, of the coming of the Lord to judgment (ch. i. 7, 8), and the setting up of the kingdom; with *Christ's* Advent he connects by means of one article *our* gathering together away (or *upwards*, LÜNEMANN)* unto Him; the two together form one event, the first completing itself in the second. For the topic, 1 Thess. iv. 17 may be compared; for the word likewise, Matt. xxiv. 31 (the verb; the substantive is used in Heb. x. 25 of assemblies for Divine service). The import of the entreaty is expressed in the form of a purpose; εἰς τό, as in 1 Thess. ii. 12; iii. 10; **that ye should not be quickly shaken**; ταχέως does not stand here, as in Gal. i. 6, in opposition to a previous better condition; nor does it mean, as OLSHAUSEN supposes, *so soon after my exhortations to you;* but (DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN): *so soon as any one tells you something of that sort, forthwith.* Σαλευθῆναι, moreover, is the expression that denotes the heaving of the sea; then figuratively, to excite an uproar (Acts xvii. 13); connected with ἀπό it has a pregnant force (like καταργεῖσθαι ἀπό, Rom. vii. 2; comp. also Rom. ix. 3 and 2 Thess. i. 9): *shaken and thereby driven from* [WORDSWORTH: *drifted off from*]; thrown out of your *reason;* † for that is the meaning of the word, as in 1 Cor. xiv. 14, 19; Rom. xiv. 5; not *sententia* (GROTIUS), *persuasio;* that were γνώμη, or some such word. Accordingly: Hold fast a rational, sober thoughtfulness, which is required for your peaceful trial, and the due performance of your daily task. Attached to this, according to the best authorities, by μηδέ (the manuscripts, indeed, vary exceedingly in the case of such particles), is θροεῖσθαι, which, again, is not simply synonymous with σαλευθ. (that would be implied in μήτε), but ascensive; θροεῖν signifies *to cry aloud, make a noise,* and then later, *to frighten by uproar* (Matt. xxiv. 6). ZWINGLI: *to perplex, confound;* BENGEL: *moveamini, mente; turbemini, affectu;* according to HOFMANN, θροεῖσθαι also should signify merely *to be discomposed;* but then the climax would be destroyed. That a panic could not occur amongst the Thessalonians, it would be too much to assert. Even a crisis that is longed for, when it is one of so great and holy a sort, and so seriously searches the heart, can strike a momentary terror; ‡ whereas in σαλευθ. we think chiefly of being thrown from the track by an overpowering hope [?].—**Neither by spirit**, &c.; by this the Apostle intends a spiritual suggestion, pretended prediction, utterance of a prophet, comp. 1 Thess. v. 20: Despise not prophesyings, but prove them, whether error is not intermingled. It is a mistake to understand thereby a false interpretation of Old Testament prophecy, or—which is still more absurd—delusive spiritual apparitions.—**Nor by word nor by letter as by us**; THEODORET, GROTIUS, WETSTEIN, DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN [DAVIDSON, *Revision*, ELLICOTT] would refer ὡς δι' ἡμῶν to the two preceding members, as in v. 15 the Apostle's word and epistle stand together; and then some should have carried round a pretended oral utterance of his, others even a spurious letter. But v. 15 cannot determine for v. 2; and, reading μήτε three times (the evidence for the various readings is very precarious and unequal), we must regard the three members as coördinate, and not take two of them in closer connection with each other. Unless, therefore, ὡς δι' ἡμῶν is to be confined to the last member merely, it must be referred also to the first [so ERASMUS, REICHE, BARNES, WEBSTER and WILKINSON.—J. L.]. But that is not possible, since a prophetic appearance could not be invented for the Apostle like a word or a letter. We therefore adhere to CHRYSOSTOM, THEOPHYLACT, ZWINGLI, CALVIN, EWALD, HOFMANN, in not regarding λόγου as a word hawked around as apostolic, but in understanding it, alongside of πνεύματος, of a διδαχή that reasoned without prophetic rapture, rather perhaps with proofs from Scripture; comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 26; CHRYSOSTOM: πιθανολογία. There is no occasion to think of a calculation of Daniel's weeks of years. The last member, finally, first JEROME, then KERN, HILGENFELD [HAMMOND, WEBSTER and WILKINSON] and others, would explain to the effect that the Apostle is speaking merely of a misinterpretation of his First Epistle: Be not disturbed by letter, as if we had taught so. But in that case δι' ἐπιστολῆς would not stand without the article; 1 Cor. v. 9, 11 and 2 Cor. vii. 8 show the style in which he appeals to an earlier epistle from his hand. The two members, πνεῦμα and λόγος, denote means of seduction that had actually occurred, and had come, indeed, from people in Thessalonica (nothing suggests, as in Corinth, foreign intruders); the same thing must hold good also of a letter, that was falsely attributed to him; Paul would not of himself have thought of speaking of it [against JOWETT]; ch. iii. 17 also cannot be naturally explained otherwise than as a precaution against a repetition of the forgery. It is as surprising that such a thing occurred at that time, as that Paul speaks of it so gently. HUG thinks that the forger need have had no evil design; he merely wished, perhaps, with apostolic authority to agitate the secure, and work a reformation. Still a *pia fraus* is none the less a *fraus.* It is possible, however, that the letter was written anonymously, and merely shown around as Pauline. Otherwise, it is probable, Paul would speak more sharply.

The import of this deceptive pretence was: **as that the day of the Lord is present** [so ALFORD. ELLICOTT: *is now come.*—J. L.]. ὡς before ὅτι expresses what is supposed; 2 Cor. xi. 21; WINER, § 65. 9; ἐνέστηκεν denotes a standing at the door, immediate presence (Rom. viii. 38; 1 Cor. iii. 22; Gal. i. 4). The emphatic position of the verb in front shows, that the Apostle does not intend generally to put far away the expectation of the last day; we are merely not to let ourselves be surprised by the cry: *Here it is now!* Probably the fresh outbreak of singularly violent persecutions was explained in Thessalonica to this effect: *Here is the beginning of the last day.*

2. (Vv. 3–5.) **Let no one deceive you in any way**; be not deluded (Eph. v. 6); in none of those three specified ways? or, in no other way? Both views are possible; at 1 Thess. v. 3 he had described the deception of a careless drowsiness, and now he points to the opposite snare, when a con-

* [There is neither *away* nor *upwards* (*hin* oder *empor*) in the ἐπί, which simply "marks the point to be reached—losing its idea of superposition in that of approximation to or juxtaposition" (ELLICOTT). WEBSTER and WILKINSON: "to *meet* Him."—J. L.]

† [*Revision:* "The nearest approach that our idiom allows is, when we speak of a man being *driven out of his mind.*"—J. L.]

‡ [If the Thessalonians were induced to believe that the day of the Lord had *really come* (the proper force of ἐνέστηκεν), there would be a sufficient ground of alarm in the apparent failure in their case of the promise in 1 Thess. iv. 17. For a careful discussion of vv. 1, 2 the reader is referred to my *Lectures on the Thessalonians*, pp. 491–504.—J. L.]

scientious vigilance is perverted into an unwholesome excitement, which is then likely, in consequence of the exposure that follows, to threaten faith itself with shipwreck. Against this delusion, as against every other, they are to be on their guard. —**Because**, he thus confirms the warning. The protasis with *ἐάν* has no apodosis, as often happens with Paul; so Rom. ii. 17, according to the best reading; he lost sight of it in the course of the long description; sometimes also (Rom. ix. 22) there lies in the ellipsis a certain reserve of judgment. Here the very obvious supplement is *οὐ μὴ πάρεσται ἡ ἡμέρα*, or *οὐ δύναται ἐλθεῖν ὁ κύριος*, or some such expression. [WEBSTER and WILKINSON: "The omission arises from the fact that he is reminding them of communications previously made concerning two future events, and wishes to fix their attention upon that which *must* precede the other. It may also be regarded as rhetorical, supplied in the Apostle's dictation by a solemn pause, a gesture, and the significant and emphatic delivery of the words *ἐὰν . . . πρῶτον*, or as suggesting the sentiment, *I am sorry to have it to say* it will not come before; and so BENGEL, *abstinet verbis quæ non libenter audiret amator adventus Christi.*"—J. L.] Altogether unsuitable is any thought of the oath-formula, אִם לֹא, *certissime* [STORR], besides that this also needs explanation as an ellipsis.—**Except there come the apostasy first** (*ἀποστασία*, later Greek for the older *ἀπόστασις*); this is erroneously applied by CHRYSOSTOM, THEODORET, THEOPHYLACT, AUGUSTINE, to Antichrist, as if it meant an apostasy in one individual, whereas the two verbs suffice to distinguish also the two subjects; nor yet is it to be understood politically or semi-politically, but according to universal biblical usage it denotes apostasy from the faith or from God [Acts xxi. 21. Comp. 1 Tim. iv. 1; Sept. Jer. xxix. 32.—J. L.]. HOFMANN, correctly: ch. i. having commended their steadfastness in the faith, the apostasy can only be one from the faith in Christ; and this is acknowledged also by CALVIN. Indeed, the article denotes *that* apostasy known to the Thessalonians by oral instruction from the prophets; comp. Dan. viii. 23; xi. 30; the spreading apostasy from the faith. Then in *ἀνομία* of v. 7 we find an intimation of the further result, that the revolt from God leads to the rejection of all Divine order. Already in those times of fresh faith is this foreseen and foretold by Paul.—**And the Man of Sin be revealed**; frightful counterpart to the revelation from above (ch. i. 7); when there is a disclosure of that which is maturing as the wicked consummation of the evil principle in humanity —of that which at present is still *μυστήριον*, the counterpart of the heavenly (v. 7), but shall one day have its *παρουσία* (v. 9). *The Man of Sin*, again with the article, the one already known to them; plainly a single personality; if ZWINGLI after some of the ancients explains it collectively, as if it stood for *filii perditi*, there is no warrant for this in the context. The complete opposite to Christ is not a spiritual tendency, but a person. Nor is he called merely *ἁμαρτωλός*, but the Man of Sin, in contrast with Jesus, the Man of obedience; so to speak, the incarnate Sin, wherein the entire nature of sin is concentrated, incorporated, culminates; just as what follows marks the opposite pole to Gen. iii. There the desire came up, but still in childish form, to wish to be their own God; what began there will here be fully ripened. Thus is his nature described; and in connection with that his final destiny: **the son of perdition**, like Judas, his type, John xvii. 12. With the fact, that he wholly belongs to sin, coheres as fruit the fact, that he falls a prey to perdition; out of perdition springs his life in death; *εἰς ἀπώλειαν ὑπάγει* (Rev. xvii. 11). Others would take it actively, or at least unite the two ideas [THEODORET]: one who is a sinner and falls into perdition, and also drags others down into sin and perdition; according to v. 9 sqq. he really does that; but in the phrase, *son of perdition*, there is rather a designation of the power to which he belongs; ESTIUS: *quasi ex perditione tanquam matre genitus;* as if it were even said, *a child of death*. The mention of his fate is followed by a description of his manner of working (as v. 8 by v. 9); it is said of him: **who opposeth**, like Satan, Zech. iii. 1, Sept.; what the latter is for the world of spirits, that the Man of Sin is for the world of men; no incarnation, therefore, of Satan. We can take *ὁ ἀντικείμενος* absolutely, and in thought supply *of God* or *of Christ;* the former, because he assails not merely the redemptive work of Christ, but the foundation of all fear of God; and for the second it may be said, that in an altogether peculiar sense he will be the antagonist, adversary, caricature of Christ; according to John's expression, the *ἀντίχριστος* (1 John ii. 18), the Antichrist; fain would he destroy Christ's kingdom, and opposes him, as BENGEL says, *corde, lingua, stilo, factis, per se, per suos.* But considering that the article is not repeated before the second participle, and that thus the two predicates are combined into one idea (negative and positive), we might prefer to refer the *ἐπί* by an easy zeugma to both participles.* Who **exalteth himself above all that is [against every one] called God or an object of worship**; against the true God, and every one so called, comp. 1 Cor. viii. 5; to this the Apostle adds (every) *σέβασμα*, that is, object of worship, *numen;* LUTHARDT: whatever is holy to men, and passes amongst them as an object of fearful reverence; comp. Acts xvii. 23. To think of the defamation of the imperial majesty (the *Σεβαστός*) is still more inappropriate, than of angels; it was done in the interest of the interpretation which saw in Antichrist the Pope, as the despiser of worldly sovereignty. We have rather to understand it thus: above all that *is called* God and is divinely *honored*. He will thus no longer act as the old kings, Pharaoh and Sennacherib, acted, who indeed blasphemed the God of Israel, but still worshipped their heathen gods; he will despise also the gods of the heathen. To adore these was a profound corruption; still even in that caricature the need of worship announced itself. But the Man of Sin, being the consummmate *ἀντίθεος*, as CHRYSOSTOM calls him, will worship nothing any more, bow before nothing any more. All religion he treads under his feet. Herein consists the ripe poisonous fruit of evil, that with full consciousness self sets up to be the centre of all power, wisdom, and glory. The Apostle's brief picture reminds us of (though it still transcends) Dan. vii. 8, 11, 20 sqq.: the horu with man's eyes and a mouth speaking great things, which makes war with the saints and overcomes them till

* [And so BENSON, KOPPE, PELT, WEBSTER and WILKINSON. But the best interpreters generally reject the zeugma (DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, &c.). In the New Testament *ἀντίκειμαι* is construed with the simple dative.—J. L.]

the judgment breaks forth. The modern interpreters see in this for the most part Antiochus Epiphanes; more correctly we shall recognize in this little horn of the 7th chapter the yet future adversary, of whom Antiochus, described in similar terms, is but a type (see AUBERLEN's *Daniel*). Antiochus, the Old Testament Antichrist, is meant in Dan. viii. 9 sqq., 23 sqq.; xi. 36 sqq.* The last passage, in particular, depicts him as speaking presumptuous things against the God of gods, and as despising also the gods of his fathers; only on the God of strongholds, that is, on military power, does he rely. Still, self-deification is not expressly asserted of him; Antiochus even turned the Temple of Jerusalem into a temple of the Olympian Zeus. Paul adheres to Daniel's description, and can do so, just because Antiochus is a type of the last adversary. For the further stroke, with which he goes beyond Daniel, the self-deification of the Roman Emperor furnished him with a ready example.—**So that he sitteth down in** [εἰς τὸν ναόν, pregnant: *intrudes into, and sits down in*, &c.—J. L.] **the temple of God;** καθίσαι is intransitive; αὐτὸν (not αὑτόν) is not redundant (PELT), but emphatic; he, the audacious; he in person sits down enthroned in the temple; does not merely have his image set up; in *the* temple *of God*, the article and the addition, *of God*, showing that at any rate no heathen temple is to be thought of, but, if one of stone, then no other than that of Jerusalem, which, if the Epistle is genuine, was not yet destroyed. That that one is not to be thought of in an Epistle to a church of Gentile Christians (VON GERLACH), is a groundless objection. The temple which Christ had cleansed, and in which the first Christians prayed, and likewise Paul himself, that house of prayer for all people was an object of interest to every Christian church. Still, one can just as little perceive, why the sitting in the temple must be interpreted with all the rigid literality that, amongst others, WIESELER (*Chronol. des apostol. Zeitalters*, p. 258) and DÖLLINGER (*Christenthum und Kirche*, p. 282) assert. We do not at once say with CHRYSOSTOM and others, that the temple signifies the Church in all lands, or with HILGENFELD (p. 253), that the writer means figuratively the consummation of heresy establishing itself in the spiritual temple of Christendom (it then concerns him to show the feasibility of the Epistle having been composed under Trajan); but we suppose that, proceeding on a sensuous way of viewing the matter, and painting, as a prophet (Ez. xxviii. 2), in colors of his own time, Paul depicts an act which, as a symbol of permanent spiritual significance, is confined to no locality, and means to say: He places himself in God's room, and forces himself on mankind as a Divine ruler.† See the Exegetical Note 3.—**Showing himself forth that he is God,** as described more at large in Rev. xiii. What belongs to Christ, this impious person arrogates to himself, advancing the claim, that for those on the earth he is God; and thus wickedness becomes frantic. The self-exhibition we understand, with CHRYSOSTOM and most, not merely of assertions in words or proclamations, but of manifestations which should confirm the point by deeds; for the lying wonders, v. 9 sqq., shall deceive many. We cannot see why LÜNEMANN finds in this a contradiction of καθίσαι.—Gently chiding them, the Apostle finally reminds them of the instruction which he had orally imparted to them. So far had he gone during the three weeks into the details of eschatology. But to the Apostle this same point of doctrine was of more importance than to our moderns; comp. Paul at Athens, Acts xvii. 31. [Notice here also the force of ἔλεγον, *I was telling, used to tell.*—J. L.] Even the mediæval missionaries laid very great stress on the judgment. As the Thessalonians had to endure peculiar afflictions, Paul would seem to have led them into a special acquaintance with Daniel.

3. (Vv. 6–8.) **And now ye know what withholdeth;** καὶ νῦν is taken by BENGEL, STORR, KERN, HILGENFELD and others as a temporal adverb in opposition to ἔτι of v. 5. LÜNEMANN's objection, that in that case it must have been said: ταῦτα μὲν ἔτι—νῦν δὲ καί, does not amount to a great deal, except, indeed, that one does not exactly know how the point in contrast should be conceived of. Are we to understand it thus: Now, since you have learned the beginning of that matter, you know it as you did not previously? But what, then, had occurred, that could give them such information, even without the Apostle's explanation? Here ROOS and BRANDT think of the recent expulsion of the tumultuous Jews from Rome, and similar facts, which might show them how the pseudo-Messianic element was held down by the Roman power. But that would be at least very obscurely expressed, in a case especially where they needed a renewal of their earlier instruction; and now would he in such an altogether disguised manner announce the new topic, which present circumstances supplied in contrast with his oral instruction? This has little to recommend it. Still more arbitrary is HILGENFELD's inference, that in this opposition the later date of the Epistle betrays itself, as if καὶ νῦν could only be understood thus: *and now, some 40 years after the Apostle's death!* DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN, EWALD [ALFORD, ELLICOTT] see in καὶ νῦν the indication of a logical advance to a new thought: *And now ye know surely* (LÜNEMANN: by way of passing on to a further point). They appeal to Acts vii. 34; x. 5; xiii. 11; xx. 25; but in all these places νῦν may also be taken temporally, whereas in our text it is not apparent why the simple καί should not have been used. OLSHAUSEN, WIESELER, and others assume an inversion, as in the case of ἔτι in Rom. v. 6 (various reading), WINER, § 61. 4. Of course, it would have been easy to write: καὶ τὸ νῦν κατέχον; but it is true that we most naturally expect in the first member of the verse an offset to ἐν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ καιρῷ. This HOFMANN would obtain by taking also v. 6 interrogatively, and the οὐ of v. 5 as still operative: *Remember ye not—, and know (ye not) now (when his time has not yet arrived), what withholdeth, &c.?* This, however, is too artificial.

On the contrary, we obtain a very simple explanation of νῦν as a particle of time, if we understand it thus: *And now, when ye recall my oral instruction, ye know.* And so it follows also, what must have been probable beforehand (against HILGEN-

* [ELLICOTT: "This characteristic of impious exaltation is in such striking parallelism with that ascribed by Daniel to 'the king that shall do according to his will' (ch. xi. 36), that we can scarcely doubt that the ancient interpreters were right in referring both to the same person,—Antichrist. The former portion of the prophecy in Daniel is apparently correctly referred to Antiochus Epiphanes, but the concluding verses (ver. 36 sq.) seem only applicable to him of whom Antiochus was merely a type and shadow."—J. L.]

† [ELLICOTT, without excluding the figurative interpretation of CHRYSOSTOM, at the same time leans strongly to an ultimate fulfilment in a future temple (Ez. xxxvii. 26) at Jerusalem.—J. L.]

FELD), that the oral instruction already extended to the κατέχον, on which account he can speak of it the more briefly in writing. The meaning of the latter word is not, as DÖLLINGER supposes, *what possesses, controls*, but, as in Rom. i. 18, *what restrains, hinders;* CHRYSOSTOM: τὸ κωλύον; CALVIN: *impedimentum, causa moræ;* but not: *what hinders me from expressing myself freely;* that were an altogether arbitrary interpretation, and is thoroughly confuted by v. 7; but: *what still retards* the outbreak and manifestation of Antichrist. The neuter in v. 6 denotes the power, the principle; the masculine in v. 7, a personality at the head of that power; at least, this is *a priori* the most natural suggestion. Moreover, εἰς τό denotes, not so much the duration (*until*), as the purpose of God in the κατέχειν: **that he may be revealed in his [own] time;** he, none other than the Man of Sin, is to step forth from his concealment in his time, the time fixed for him, measured out to him as his own; a time will come, that belongs to him, as the present does not yet; measured out, indeed, to him also only by God; comp. Luke xxii. 53; the counterpart of the fulness of the time, Gal. iv. 4. With the *for* that follows Paul accounts for his having spoken of the restraining of the Man of Sin, and of his revelation as still future. The ungodly element was really present already, and had a strong desire to break forth, but must still work as a dark mystery; not exactly in secret, but so that the wickedness does not yet expose its full nature. Μυστήριον forms an antithesis to ἀποκαλυφθῆναι of v. 6; there is an emphasis in its being put first, and separated from its genitive, as in Gal. ii. 6, 9. The latter is a genitive either of apposition [DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN, ALFORD]: *the mystery which consists in lawlessness*, or of possession: *which belongs to it;** ungodliness also having its mystery, the frightful counterpart to that of godliness, 1 Tim. iii. 16; comp. the βάθη τοῦ σατανᾶ, Rev. ii. 24, over against the βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ, 1 Cor. ii. 10. HOFMANN would understand it merely thus: *the confounding, incomprehensible, inconceivable extreme of wickedness;* but the contrast with the revelation should not be set aside. OLSHAUSEN goes beyond Scripture, when on account of the antithesis he speaks of an incarnation of Satan, when it will be said: ὁ διάβολος ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί; there is nothing of that here, and even John vi. 70 is rather against than for it. ESTIUS correctly: *non diabolus, sed diaboli præcipuum organum est.* Antichrist is, indeed, depicted as the caricature of Christ. But v. 7 does not yet treat of his person, but of the principle of lawlessness now already in action privately. Thereby is denoted the profligacy which violates every Divine law, knows nothing but a complete autonomy, endures no will over it; Dan. xi. 36 may be compared: He will do κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ. Here the remark is not convincing, that the expressions ἀνομία and, v. 8, ἄνομος point us for Antichrist to the Gentile domain (Rom. ii. 12; 1 Cor. ix. 21); still more groundlessly others say, to the Jewish. When HOFMANN, starting from Daniel, remarks that the faithless will fall a prey to Antichrist, as the apostate Jews did to Antiochus, that is no doubt true; only it does not necessarily follow that he himself will proceed from among the Gentiles. Rather we may say that the result of apostasy from the gospel will be a new and consummate heathenism, the rejection not merely of faith, but of every Divine ordinance. At the height of the Antichristian wickedness, however, the differences between Jews and Gentiles disappear, as they do on the other hand under the gospel. *The mystery is already working* (ἐνεργεῖται never passive,* but middle); ἤδη is in opposition to v. 6, *in his [own] time*, and then ἄρτι answers to ἤδη, and the τότε of v. 8 to *in his [own] time.* Paul regards the phenomena of the time with the eyes of the Spirit; in the opposition to the moral order of things, but especially in resistance to Christ, he perceives the beginning of the final rebellion against final grace. This is to him the working of a terrible mystery, such as not many yet recognize. He sees before him (DE WETTE) the scattered, shapeless mass of ungodliness, which is first to gain form and personality in Antichrist, and by which his appearance is prepared and introduced, as is the case with every historical personage. In Thessalonica especially he had lived to see the fanatical hostility of the Jews prove false amongst the heathen to their Messianic hope (Acts xvii. 7). The self-deification of the Emperor, and perhaps also already the false Gnosis of a Simon, were other features of that depravity.

In the sequel μόνον belongs not to what precedes [thus JOWETT suggests as possible a connection with μυστήριον: *only as a hidden mystery;* WORDSWORTH connects with ἐνεργεῖται: *worketh inwardly only;*—both constructions equally untenable.—J. L.], which is already defined by ἤδη, but to what follows; the clause introduced by it limits in a certain way the preceding statement. As the Vulgate translates: *tantum ut qui tenet nunc teneat*, so many supply out of κατέχων a verb, κατέχει, καθέξει, κατεχέτω, or even (BENGEL), from the following ἐκ μέσου γένηται, an *in medio est.* [Many supply simply the verb of existence, and with that WEBSTER and WILKINSON connect ἄρτι: *is now.*—J. L.] ZWINGLI understands it thus (an interpretation already known to Augustine): "only he, who now holds aught, should hold it fast (whatever he has apprehended of the truth), till he (Antichrist) is taken out of the way." But all these supplements are arbitrary. CALVIN, who construes correctly, is just as mistaken in his explanation: *until he* (Antichrist), *who now* (that is, in the future for a short time) *holds sway, is removed;* and then he must refer the τότε to v. 6. This view has simply everything against it; I urge only the one point, that he thus takes ὁ κατέχων in a totally different sense from τὸ κατέχον, v. 6; whereas the remark cannot be avoided, that the one must correspond to the other, only that the masculine indicates a personality standing at the head. If again there are not two clauses but one, we have merely to recognize an inversion, namely, that as regards the sense ἕως ought to be first, whereas ὁ κατ. is put first for the sake of emphasis; comp. Gal. ii. 10 [and so the clause is now generally construed; see *Revision.*—J. L.]. Accordingly: *The mystery is already working, only until* (so long must it remain a mystery), *only until he, who withholdeth for the present, is out of the way.* That the latter phrase *might* denote a violent death, is not to be denied; that it *must* do so, is not to be asserted; indeed, comparing Col. ii. 14, and not even reading here αἴρεσθαι, but γενέσθαι (comp. 1 Cor. ii. 2; 1 Tim. ii. 14), we perceive that as to

* [ELLICOTT: "Simply a gen. *definitions*, or gen. of the characterizing principle or quality."—J. L.]

* [As Bishop BULL makes it both here and at 1 Thess. ii. 13.—J. L.]

the manner, in which the κατέχων gets out of the way, the expression says absolutely nothing; by a peaceful withdrawal on his part, we shall of course not say, since there is a judgment in his being called off. Who now is the κατέχων, is really the darkest point in the whole passage, now that we have no longer the oral interpretation; a proof, what oral tradition would amount to without a written record. Comp. the Doctrinal Note 3.—**And then shall be revealed the Lawless one**; the ἀνομία in person, the Head of wickedness in full expression; certainly none other than the Man of Sin, v. 3.—From the mention of the revelation, vs. 3, 6, 8, and of the παρουσία, v. 9, HOFMANN finally infers (*die Heilige Schrift neuen Testaments*, I., p. 330 sqq.), that there is here described a counterpart of Christ, that cannot be fully understood unless we recognize Antichrist also as already in existence, so that he will enter into the world anew from the supermundane sphere. It is not said, he suggests, that the ἀνομία, but that the ἄνομος will be revealed. This is the reason why HOFMANN was so bent on setting aside the antithesis between μυστήριον and ἀποκαλ. Antiochus Epiphanes himself, he thinks, may again be expected. This, however, is an exaggeration of the Scriptural statements, that lapses into extravagance. The Man of Sin will come (παρουσία) and be revealed (will discover himself to be what he is, and what from a child he was not taken for) in and by the complete disclosure of the ἀνομία, which previously kept working as μυστήριον;—this surely is sufficient for us to find in him the counterpart of Christ. Even HOFMANN will not go so far as to assume an incarnation of Satan. Comp. AUBERLEN, *Daniel*, 2d edition, p. 456 sq., and LUTHARDT, *die Lehre von den letzten Dingen*, p. 150. The latter properly refers to Mal. iii. 23 [iv. 5], where there is a promise of the sending of Elijah, which, however, is afterwards explained, in Luke i. 17; Matt. xi. 14; xvii. 11, 12, of John, the new Elijah,* just as Rev. xi. 6 holds out no prospect of the return of the former Elijah. It is not the Elijah of history, says LUTHARDT, that we have to expect, but the Elijah of prophecy; comp. also Ezek. xxxiv. 23. Such literal interpretation as that practised by HOFMANN should be left to the popular fancy of the Jews (Matt. xvi. 14).—**Whom the Lord (Jesus) shall consume**; he thus becomes υἱὸς ἀπωλείας; the consolation that he is to be destroyed, is attached by Paul immediately to the mention of his appearance. The Godless one comes at the time appointed for him by God, and is consumed by Jesus; his tyranny, therefore, is no sign of weakness on the part of God. Is. xi. 4 has not merely had an influence on the reading, but it is also a parallel for the subject matter.—**With the spirit [breath] of His mouth**, &c.; in German we do not have, as in Hebrew and Greek, the same word for *spirit* and *breath*. We must not with a coarse sensuousness think of a fiery wind, nor yet at once idealize the matter, as if what is meant were a word, shout, word of command; why in that case should not λόγος have been used? The explanation of the old Protestants was, that the word of God has inwardly, spiritually slain Antichrist (namely, the Pope), and the Advent will make a full end of him. The glowing parallelism of the clauses, however, intends not two acts, but only one. It is a counterpart to the description of creation in Ps. xxxiii. 6 Sept. The view proceeds on the ground of sense. Nothing is required but the breath of the Lord, which has power, as being the spirit of life, quickening for them that are His (John xx. 22), but, amongst His enemies, who can bear it? One breath of the Lord scatters haughty power. Comp. Rev. xix. 15, 21, the *sharp word out of His mouth;* GROTIUS refers also to Hos. xiii. 3. Equally sublime is the second clause: **and** (shall) **destroy** (him) **with the appearing of His coming**; καταργεῖν, *to destroy, abolish* (1 Cor. ii. 6; xv. 24), does not imply the utter annihilation of his personal existence, for indeed he is cast into the lake of fire (Revelation). Elsewhere the Lord's coming is denoted either by παρουσία, or by ἐπιφάνεια, 2 Tim. iv. 8; here the two are combined: by the appearing, the visibleness of His coming; He could, of course, come also invisibly. ZWINGLI's application of this to the daily coming of His word into the hearts of believers must be rejected. Mere caprice also is the Irvingite distinction between the *parousia* [coming], by which believers from among the Gentiles shall be caught away to the Lord, and the subsequent appearing of the *parousia* [coming], in which the Jews are concerned (comp. the Doctrinal and Ethical Notes on 1 Thess. iv. 17, and also LUTHARDT, p. 37 sqq., especially 43). BENGEL's remark might be more worthy of attention, that the expression denotes the first gleam of the Advent, as distinguished from the final judgment; though here also somewhat too great stress is put upon it.* But this much is true, that there is needed merely the first outburst of the Advent, nothing but that He show Himself [Ps. xciv. 1], no organs for the exertion of His power; BENGEL: *prima ipsius adventus emicatio*. An earnest of this in John xviii. 6.†

4. (Vv. 9–12.) **Whose coming is**, &c.; οὗ, as well as the ὃν of v. 8, referring again to the ἄνομος of that verse. Only now, after he has already by way of consolation shown the end of the wicked one, is the description of his agency resumed. It will be terrible and destructive, but for that very reason will end in a holy judgment, and therefore the description can again resolve itself into thanksgiving, v. 13 sqq., that the Thessalonians do not belong to the apostates. HOFMANN accordingly takes vv. 9–17 together, there being here shown, he thinks, as in ch. i., that punishment of unbelief, in which the appearance of the Lawless One will issue, in opposition to the salvation which will be for the Church the result of the proclamation of the apostolic message. It is true that the theme of v. 3 (the Lord comes not, till Antichrist has appeared) is discharged at v. 8; but the description of his working, v. 9 sqq., serves still for the completion of the picture, and indirectly for the warning of the readers: his power will be in the highest degree seductive; let every one, therefore, beware of the first beginnings of apostasy (vv. 2, 3); for whosoever believes the lie is lost (vv. 10, 11). But ye, thank God, are of those who believe the truth, and are chosen to

* [That the promise in Malachi was *exhausted* by the ministry of the Baptist, is not quite so certain. Comp. OLSHAUSEN on the passages cited, also Judge JOEL JONES' *Notes on Scripture*, Philadelphia, 1861.—J. L.]

* [That there is an interval of time between our Lord's descent from the right hand of the Father into the region of the air, where His gathered saints are admitted into His presence, and His coming *with them* to the judgment of the nations, is not only in itself a perfectly reasonable and scriptural idea, but one of use in harmonizing the various, and at first sight apparently discrepant, descriptions of the manner of the Advent, and of the condition of the world in that day.—J. L.]

† [Comp. *Revision*, and *Lectures*, on this verse.—J. L.]

salvation (v. 13); therefore abide therein, stand fast, and hold fast what ye have received (v. 15). The appearance of the Lawless *is*, takes place, says the Apostle in the present tense, doctrinally, without regard to the time; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 35.—**According to the working of Satan,** *κατά*, as in Col. i. 29. Satan gives him power, as the Father does to Christ (Rev. xiii. 2); it is the most perfect mimicry of Christ: salvation (in wonders) without repentance and the cross. But it is asked, whether *κατὰ*, &c. is a definition of the *ἐστίν*, or of *ἐστὶν ἐν*, &c.; whether his appearance is already of itself in the might of Satan, or rather his appearance with wonders. HOFMANN prefers the former view; that his coming is 1. according to the working of Satan, and 2. a coming in wonders. But it is better, with LÜNEMANN and others, to understand his coming as attended with wonders to be that, the source of which is assigned by *κατ' ἐνέργ.** There will be in it a putting forth of every power; *πάσῃ* without the article belonging by zeugma to all the three substantives. *Δύναμις* denotes the root of the operations; *σημεῖα*, *signs*, in their significance as indicating the divinity of him who performs them—here of course deceptive; lastly, *τέρατα*, *portenta*, the marvelousness of these indications. The three terms are often used of the deeds of Christ and the Apostles. Here we have the caricature; comp. the wonders of the false prophets, Matt. xxiv. 24, whereby even the elect would be deceived, were that possible. These prophets are, as it were, Antichrist's apostles; in Rev. xiii. 13 sqq. it is *the* false prophet in the singular, who represents hypocritical, Godless wisdom, and by his signs procures homage for the first beast (the Godless despot). Paul does not yet say by whom (as distinct from the *ἄνομος* himself) the wonders shall be wrought.—The wonders are called **wonders of falsehood** (*ψεύδους* again belonging to all the three words) in opposition to the wonders of truth in the case of Christ and His Apostles (as Paul asserts that he had wrought wonders, 2 Cor. xii. 12). To find in the genitive *ψεύδους* a designation simply of the origin, or simply of the object, or simply of the quality of those wonders, is an unwarrantable separation of what belongs all together.† Moreover, AUGUSTINE is already aware of a double interpretation, what is meant being either a deception of the senses by empty illusions without reality (so THEODORET), or real miracles misleading to a false belief in them as performed by Divine power. AUGUSTINE, referring to Job, prefers the second view, and so with reason most others. To this conclusion we are at once led by the emphatic description by means of three synonyms. We also expect as counterparts to the miracles of Christ real operations, which yet are called miracles of falsehood (Roos), because men who regard them as proofs of the divintity of the unrighteous One are thereby miserably deceived. Performed by dark, gloomy powers, they are indeed at bottom nothing really creative, but assumptions, imitations, manifestations of a sham strength which at last is a wretched impotence, monstrosities without any saving object, but not, therefore, mere juggleries. The Bible throughout treats sorcery in a more serious way than as if it were empty legerdemain.—What follows likewise: **and in all deceitfulness of unrighteousness,** &c., does not mean an idle illusion, but an agency which has the glittering show of righteousness, and yet is full of unrighteousness, proceeding from that, and leading to it; the absolute culmination of unrighteousness is in robbing God of His glory. (The oldest authorities omit the article at *ἀδικίας*, as well as at *ψεύδους*). The Apostle shows us as a mark of the Man of Sin, besides the false miracles, the profanity also of his spirit and walk, and, besides lying (which again is an intentional falsification of knowledge), the wickedness also of his will generally; both in contrast with the *ἀλήθεια*. This influence he has, however, only *amongst those who are perishing*, in their circle (if *ἐν* were genuine; comp. 2 Cor. ii. 15; iv. 3); but the oldest authorities give simply the dative (*incommodi*): *for* the perishing (not a dative of judgment, as in 1 Cor. i. 18; ix. 2). It belongs also to what is said at v. 9.* The *ἀπολλύμενοι* (1 Cor. i. 18) are not those who have already perished, nor yet those who deserve to perish, but such as are perishing, are actually on the way to perdition, and that through their own fault, as is said in the next clause: **because they accepted not;** *ἀνθ' ὧν*, equivalent to *ἀντὶ τούτων ὅτι*, חַחַת אֲשֶׁר, Luke i. 20. He does not say: *they received not the truth*, but: **the love of the truth.** CHRYSOSTOM, THEODORET, THEOPHYLACT err in supposing that by this Christ is meant, who has truly loved us (in that case the phrase should rather have been, *the truth of love*). The Apostle rather gives us to understand, that the natural man by himself is not merely destitute of the truth, but has not so much as the love of the truth; even this must first be implanted in him. The sentence is to be understood comprehensively of all truth, wherever and however it comes to men. Its introductory stages are shown in Rom. i. and ii., and in Christ it culminates. In like manner, the want of love for the truth reaches its consummation in obduracy against Christ, when clearly revealed to us by the Holy Spirit. For a long while a man may go along undecided; Antichrist will drive him to a decision. God does not force the truth on a man, who suffers it not to grow up in his heart. What hinders a man from receiving the truth? That is indicated by the profound opposition between truth and unrighteousness; comp. Rom. i. 18, and the Doctrinal and Ethical Note, 5.—**[That they might be saved;** *εἰς τὸ σωθῆναι*

* [So the German versions and commentaries generally. In behalf of the other view it was remarked in *Revision*, that the clause *κατ' ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Σατανᾶ*, "taken by itself, or at least as the leading feature in the statement, yields this fuller and more appalling intimation, that the *entire* coming of the Man of Sin—his spirit and aims and measures throughout—will be instinct with the energy of Satan (CHRYSOST.: *ἄνθρωπός τις πᾶσαν αὐτοῦ δεχόμενος τὴν ἐνέργειαν*: Some man receiving all Satan's energy. So THEODOR. and ŒCUMEN.), and that, even as the Church is 'the body of Christ, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all' (Eph. i. 23; comp. v. 19; iii. 20; &c.), so in Antichrist, his masterpiece, will Satan, so to speak, exhaust himself; putting forth through him all his own resources of strength and guile, in both the spheres of his operation, the external (*ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει καὶ σημείοις καὶ τέρασι ψεύδους*) and the spiritual (*ἐν πάσῃ ἀπάτῃ τῆς ἀδικίας*). In this regard, the Syriac is worthy of note, = MURDOCK: *for the coming of that (evil One) is the working of Satan.*"—J. L.]

† [ALFORD likewise combines all three ideas; ELLICOTT hesitates between the second and third, but inclines to the last.—J. L.]

* [*Revision*: "Looking at the passage in the light of Matt. xxiv. 24 and 2 Cor. iv. 3, I am disposed to retain the close connection of these words with *ἀπάτῃ τῆς ἀδικίας*; and then it is intimated that Antichrist, though sitting in the temple of God, and displaying his pomp and his wonders before *all* the worshippers, shall nevertheless succeed in *deceiving* only the *ἀπολλύμενοι*; the reasons of which success immediately follow, as they exist on man's part (v. 10), and (v. 11) on God's."—J. L.]

αὐτούς, *in order to their being saved;* the end and result of a reception of the love of the truth, which reveals a Saviour, and brings His salvation near.—J. L.]—**And for this cause doth God send them;** (*καί* is wanting only in D.[1] 67) *for this cause*—as a punishment—we refer rather to what precedes than to what follows (so that *εἰς τὸ*, &c. would be epexegetical). He *sends* it to them—according to the best authorities the present, like *ἐστίν* of v. 9; but it does not signify *already now*, but is to be taken doctrinally, irrespective of time. Again, LUTHER's translation is, *strong errors* [*kräftige Irrthümer*]; more correctly: *strength* or **working of delusion.** Does God do that? Or does He merely permit it to come, as the Greek interpreters and others soften the expression? No, indeed; the Apostle describes the mighty act of the Judge, punishing evil by evil. Not to believe the truth is sin [to refuse the love of the truth, still darker sin.—J. L.]; to have to believe the lie is the punishment of sin, the exposure of nakedness, like the abandonment to vice in Rom. i. 24; *in* the lusts (*ἐν*), wherein they are ensnared, He gives them up *unto* uncleanness (*εἰς*), lets them slide down on the sloping path of their own desires, and that because they would not have it otherwise. The object of the sending is, **that they should believe the falsehood;** not merely the error, but the conscious, wilful, God-defying untruth. The singular with the article denotes, not a single lie, but the entire force, the entire element of the devilish perversion of all truth (John viii. 44).* GROTIUS compares Prov. i. 29–31.—**That they may be judged,** object of the *πιστεῦσαι*, that is, God's purpose therein. God has this decision in view, that they may be condemned as those in whom evil has come to maturity; CHRYSOSTOM: convicted as without excuse. *They all together*, **who believed not the truth,** who at that time shall not have believed; **but had pleasure in unrighteousness** [WEBSTER and WILKINSON: the ultimate and secret source of all the evil which results in condemnation.—J. L.]; over against the *εὐδοκία ἀγαθωσύνης*, ch. i. 11. A powerfully warning conclusion; CHRYSOSTOM: *ἔρχεται ἐλέγξων αὐτούς.* The Apostle has thus more exactly defined the nature of the judgment already spoken of in ch. i.: The appearance of the Man of Sin must help to bring about the complete separation. It is true, therefore, that the matter does not proceed so swiftly and smoothly as you fancy; but yet with all terrible earnestness it will proceed gloriously.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. (V. 2.) The Apostle's exhortations to the use of reason are far more frequent than Luther's translation allows to be seen. It is its business to understand the manifestation of God in the creation (*νοεῖν*, Rom. i. 20). The voice of conscience likewise is heard as the law of the reason (Rom. vii. 23).† It is true that the power is not thus given to man, truly to overcome the law of sin in the members. That is possible only for the spirit which is renewed by the Spirit from God (Rom. viii.). Without this the spirit falls a prey to the carnality, vanity, pollution, which affect it and the conscience (Col. ii. 18; Eph. iv. 17; Tit. i. 15). But even in the regenerate it has its work. Though the peace of God passeth all understanding, yet it too keeps the heart and thereby the thoughts (*νοήματα*, Phil. iv. 7). The Spirit of God renews the reason, bringing it under obligation, and enabling it, to apply itself to a reasonable service of God (Rom. xii. 1, 2), to attain a certainty of knowledge with full assurance (Rom. xiv. 5), yea, to search into the mysteries of God (Rev. xiii. 18; xvii. 9). Whoever neglects to cherish it may, while standing himself in the Spirit of God, become unfruitful for others (1 Cor. xiv. 14–19). The fulness of the Divine Spirit in the Apostle shows itself in this, that he does not so readily as we, on account of the abuse of which he too is aware, become distrustful towards the right use. The limits of the reason are indicated even in its German name [*Vernunft*]: it perceives [*vernimmt*] realities, which it does not itself originate.

2. Our chapter suggests a special instance of the sobriety required in 1 Thess. v. At 1 Cor. xv. 34 the Apostle describes the denial of the resurrection as a case of intoxication [*ἐκνήψατε*, *awake as from drunkenness*]; here, on the contrary, he warns against an error in the opposite direction. For it is not merely the being overcharged with worldly pleasures and cares (Luke xxi. 34 sqq.) that hinders watchfulness; but the excitement also, which would anticipate the glory, is in danger of turning into so much the greater disappointment and lassitude, and is far from being that joyful uplifting of the head (Luke xxi. 28), which implies endurance to the end, literally an *ὑπομένειν*, a bearing up under (Matt. xxiv. 13). An immoderate and presumptuous spiritualism easily ends in making shipwreck of faith. How many, who allowed themselves to be induced by a fantastic excitement to dispose of their goods and abandon their homes,* sank down afterwards into a stupid worldliness! It is also very deserving of remark, that already in the apostolic age fanaticism was the fruitful mother of fraud. The man, who will carry out his nice favorite notions under the false pretence of an apostolic name, does not stand before God. The really pseudonymous Scriptures have a different character from those, which a perverse criticism would add to them. It is no good sign, when so many have no longer the sense for distinguishing an unwholesome, impure element from the truth of God. Moreover, as regards the warning of the Apostle, and the similar words of Christ: *Go not forth! believe them not* (Matt. xxiv. 23, 26)! it may well seem strange, how often many have disregarded them. It is true, indeed, that a careless security goes not forth in advance, does not even believe that there is yet to be any Advent, and knows just nothing of the prayer, *Come, Lord Jesus!* Still, a bustling, eschatological excitement is merely a seeming faith, and in reality a self-willed precipitancy. When He actually comes, it will be as the lightning. Of the previous signs Paul says to his readers: "They will be severer than you

* [ALFORD and ELLICOTT: "the falsehood implied in the preceding words, οὐ ἐστιν—ἀδικίας, not falsehood generally." *Revision:* "The reference may be to the ψεύδους of v. 9 (comp. 1 John ii. 21, 22, ψεῦδος—ὁ ψεύστης), or possibly to that characteristic lie of Antichrist, v. 4, in which the Satanic promise in the garden (Gen. iii. 5) may be considered as finding its last and highest, but still appropriate, fulfilment."—J. L.]

† [What Paul calls "the mind" (νοῦς) in Rom. vii. 23, 25 is nothing different from "the inward man" (ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος) of v. 22; and *that* is not the natural man or carnal mind (Rom. viii. 7), but the soul as renewed.—J. L.]

* [Another allusion (see p. 336) to the sort of Millerite agitation that prevailed in some parts of Germany in 1836.—J. L.]

think;" as Jesus likewise saddens the heart of His disciples, that He may then duly comfort them. LUTHARDT properly remarks (p. 54), in reference to the Irvingite doctrine of the translation, that to promise glory without the full experience of the cross is a sign, that the flesh has to do with these notions; and he describes (p. 49) as fanatical that expectation, in which the eye is held in mere searches into the future, and draws from it no genuine strength for work in the present. From experiences of his time, JOHN GEORGE MÜLLER of Schaffhausen (as reported in GELZER's *Monatsblättern*, October, 1863, p. 211), describes the reprehensible sect-spirit as of a denunciatory (or as LAVATER calls it, a hangman) nature, delighting in strained inferences, the suppression of all reason, spiritual pride, superstition, the domination of a loud, talkative chief, &c. Apocalyptic study is of high importance, the more the mystery of lawlessness begins strongly to bestir itself; but it must throughout and constantly find its counterpoise in ethics. Indifference to the claims of the present, to the duties of the daily Christian walk, to one's temporal calling, to the weal of our fatherland, and such like interests, is not Christianity. It is not she, that in the fulness of her truth turns Christians into unfruitful visionaries. The very remembrance, that they are but strangers and pilgrims on the earth (1 Pet. ii. 11), is expressly used to introduce those exhortations, which require from every one according to his position the greatest fidelity in details.

3. (Vv. 3-10.) The INSTRUCTION CONCERNING ANTICHRIST is a highly important part of the prophetic word. The point, on which historically all are agreed, is the affinity of this section with the Book of Daniel; its dependence on the Jewish eschatology, say many; we express it more correctly by saying, that the Pauline prophecy has its root in that of the Old Testament. Let it be mentioned as a curiosity, that TYCHSEN would set aside the prophecy by the assumption, that Paul quotes sentence by sentence from a letter of the Thessalonians opinions which he then refutes. We need not prove that Paul is in earnest in delivering his doctrines. Besides the commentaries, we refer to WIESELER, *Chronologie des apostolischen Zeitalters*, 1848, p. 256 sqq.; BAUMGARTEN, *Apostelgeschichte*, 2d ed., 1859, I. 603 sqq.; and especially the instructive excursus in HEUBNER, p. 168 sqq., and in DÖLLINGER, *Christenthum und Kirche in der Zeit der Grundlegung*, 1860, p. 277 sqq., 422 sqq. Consideration is due also to what ED. BÖHMER has edited in LIEBNER's *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, iv. 3, from SCHNECKENBURGER's remains (*zur Lehre vom Antichrist*); and yet, however learnedly the Jewish opinions and those of the primitive Christians are here discussed, the essay presents not much that is satisfactory for the understanding of our passage. [Perhaps the best sketch in English of the history of opinion on this important section is that given by ALFORD in his *Prolegomena* to this Epistle, and mainly taken, as he intimates, from LÜNEMANN. See also the article *Antichrist* in Appendix B to SMITH's *Dictionary of the Bible*, where will be found a list of the principal writers on the subject.*—J. L.] We classify the interpretations as follows:

I. *The interpretation of the ancient Church.* The Fathers are essentially agreed in expecting, immediately before the still future appearing of Christ, the appearance of the personal Antichrist; only AUGUSTINE (*de Civ. Dei*, 20, 19) already takes the idea in a collective sense, so as to embrace the prince with all his adherents.* On the other hand, many understand the apostasy personally of the Antichrist. THEODORET [after CHRYSOSTOM] describes the adversary as a man who receives into himself the whole energy of the devil; if he even speaks of an imitation of the incarnation of Christ, he yet again restricts the idea to this, that Satan chooses for himself a man, who shall be possessed of all his own might. Some would also have it, that he shall be born of the tribe of Dan, and appear as a false Messiah of the Jews; but these are Jewish notions, which find acceptance only at a later period. CYRIL of Jerusalem, for example, teaches likewise (*Catech.* xv. 4-8), that he will be very skilful in magic arts, will at first appear with flatteries, but afterwards will rage against the Christians with exceeding cruelty, and that for three years and a half. Some of these traits are derived from Daniel and the Apocalypse. The sitting in the temple most explain as do THEODORET and THEOPHYLACT,† of his usurping the presidency or lordship in the Church, and giving himself out as Christ and God. Yet IRENÆUS (*Adv. Hær.* v. 25) and CYRIL of Jerusalem understand it literally of sitting in the temple at Jerusalem, which he is to display great zeal in rebuilding (CYR.). The preparatory μυστήριον ἐνεργούμενον, or, as we may even say, a strong type of Antichrist, CHRYSOSTOM (and many after him) sees in Nero (inconsistently with the date of composition);‡ THEODORET, on the contrary, in the Gnostic heresies, wherein, he thinks, is hidden the snare of lawlessness. The most uncertain point is the explanation of the κατέχον. Most saw in that the Roman Emperor (in the neuter, the Empire). CHRYSOSTOM: As the Babylonian, the Persian, the Macedonian, the Roman empires followed one another, so shall Antichrist follow the rule of the Romans. He, like AUGUSTINE and JEROME, supposes that the Apostle speaks so obscurely of the end of the Roman Empire, in order not to draw on himself the reproach of seditious preaching. He acts thus, not from cowardice, but to teach us that we should not provoke needless hostility. CHRYSOSTOM is aware also of the explanation, that the κατέχον denotes the continuance of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit; but this he refutes. THEODORE of Mopsuestia and THEODORET propose another explanation to this effect: What is meant is not the grace of the Spirit, which cannot withdraw, since without that no one could overcome; nor yet the Roman power, since this is followed by no other; but what is meant is the purpose (ὅρος) of God to restrain the outbreak till the gospel be generally spread abroad, and idolatry destroyed. In this there is something aimed at that is correct as regards the thought; but the phraseology does not suit it. The ὅρος τοῦ Θεοῦ should not ἐκ μέσου γενέσθαι, but

* [In the Amer. edition of SMITH's Dictionary, now in course of publication, the article *Antichrist* (by Rev. Fred. Meyrick), with additions by Prof. Hackett and E. Abbot, is found in its proper alphabetical order, vol. i. p. 102-113.—P. S.]

* [St. Augustine gives this simply as the opinion of *others*, *De Civ. Dei*, lib. xx. cap. 19: "*Nonnulli, non ipsum principem, sed universum quodam modo corpus ejus, id est, ad eum pertinentem hominum multitudinem simul cum ipso suo principe hoc loco intelligi Antichristum volunt.*"—P. S.]

† [CHRYSOSTOM: καθεσθήσεται εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐ τὸν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὰς πανταχοῦ ἐκκλησίας.—J. L.]

‡ [CHRYSOSTOM's own words are: Νέρωνα ἐνταῦθά φησιν, ὡσανεὶ τύπον ὄντα τοῦ Ἀντιχρίστου.—J. L.]

πληρωθῆναι, as indeed THEOPHYLACT expresses himself in explanation. On the whole, the interpretation of the Fathers is simply textual. Only as to how the prophecy adjusts itself to the temporary horizon of the Apostle, on that point they have little to say. It is not till the third century that some (and first COMMODIAN) adopt the idea, that Nero will come again as Antichrist. Then in the middle ages fantastic notions were propagated about Antichrist as an ungodly tyrant; all sorts of fables being told concerning the place and manner of his birth, and the nature and region of his operation (comp. HEUBNER, p. 170; DÖLLINGER, p. 432). But as the established Church and its hierarchy anticipated the glory of the kingdom, the coming of the Lord and also that of Antichrist retired more into the background. On the other hand, the way was preparing for

II. *The interpretation of the Reformers.* The sects of the middle ages, which arose in opposition to the secularized Church (WICLIFITES, HUSSITES, likewise SAVONAROLA and GAILER of Kaisersberg) declared the Pope to be Antichrist, and the German Emperor (as being heir of the Roman Emperor) to be the κατέχων. This was also the prevailing interpretation of the Reformers, LUTHER, ZWINGLI, CALVIN; amongst the Lutherans even a doctrine of their standards, *Artic. Smalc.*, II. 4, p. 314, and in the Appendix, p. 347 (RECHENBERG's ed.). It was said, that the removal of the κατέχων of the western Roman Empire cleared the way for Antichrist; and then the abominations of the papacy were enumerated: A falling away from the gospel to commandments of men, lust of power, oppression of the conscience, cruelty, insane pride, wicked assumption of power in heaven and on earth, and that reaching even into the life of eternity, the abuses of indulgences, charges to angels in certain bulls, the asserted power of the priest in transubstantiation, authority to change the faith and laws. In all this, it was thought, the Pope puts himself in the place of God, yea, arrogates to himself Divine attributes and idolatrous worship. One is amazed to see how much of this applies, and yet this interpretation must be rejected; that is to say, there is indeed no mistaking the fearfully antichristian features of the Papacy, and consequently its typical relation to Antichrist; but still one cannot affirm, that the Papacy is *the* Antichrist. In the first place, it should have been possible to show still more of the Popish μυστήριον ἤδη ἐνεργούμενον, already in Paul's days. Appeal was made perhaps to Gal. i. and ii.; ZWINGLI referred to the false apostles already existing at that time, who were still restrained by the great faithfulness and care of the Apostles; BENGEL to Rom. xvi. 17 sqq. and 1 Tim. iv. 1 sqq. In all that, however, the Papal tendency did not yet reach a clear expression. The way, likewise, in which the κατέχων is explained, is by no means felicitous. The German Emperor, who took the place of the Roman, also fell, and Antichrist did not come. But even if that admitted of explanation, still the features of the prophecy are not at all fulfilled in the Papacy itself. In the first place, the word of the Apostle brings into view *one* personality. It is said, indeed, that the *series et successio hominum* are not inconsistent with that, since, as in a monarchy, there is still but one head; but perhaps that one may be a pious Pope? and besides our passage speaks of the one (without followers) who is swept away; which does not agree with the Papacy. And there are yet other points that do not suit. Whilst there have been wicked Popes (occasionally, also, those of a better character), still the Pope cannot be charged with utter apostasy from Christ. He confesses the Triune God, and does by no means despise σεβάσματα. CALVIN tries in vain so to explain the Apostle's description, as if it did not imply an express self-deification. If it is said with BENGEL (and similarly BRANDT), that the abomination of the Papacy will yet attain to the highest pitch, namely, to the casting away of the mask, and the open antichristianism of the Wicked One, then we really give up the interpretation of the Reformers, and reduce the Papacy to the rank of a (momentous) prognostic of that antichristianism. Of course, the Roman Catholic DÖLLINGER cannot consent even to that; he also thinks that the supposition of an apostasy of such universal prevalence contradicts the promises given to the Church; as if the word about the "little flock," or about the "few that find" the strait gate, had no place in the gospel. ROOS, going beyond BENGEL, expressly remarks, that there is much that is antichristian in the Pope, but that there are still important deficiencies; since he still acknowledges the supremacy of God, nor does he deny the Son. The apostasy, he thinks, is here with us, but not yet the Man of Sin. In the latter Roos properly recognizes a single person; according to the Apocalypse, the last head of the beast; the false Messiah. He is of opinion, that that will be the highest pitch of the Papacy, and that it presupposes, not the destruction, but merely a great alteration, of the fourth Empire (of Daniel); the Pope, having seized all the Imperial rule that has hitherto stood in his way, will then have become Antichrist. To us it simply appears to be undemonstrated, that this consummation of evil is to be looked for as the highest pitch of the Papacy, and not rather of a Cæsaropapism. It is yet to be noticed, that already some Greek interpreters, and then Western Catholics, and also Protestants, pointed to Mohammed as the Antichrist. CALVIN reckons him and sectarianism as belonging to the great apostasy; whereas MELANCHTHON, BUCER, MUSCULUS, BULLINGER and others distinguish the Eastern Antichrist from the Western. Our fathers knew why they sang: "*The murderous violence of Pope and Turk restrain.*"* In Mohammed also there are antichristian features; he too belongs to the "many Antichrists" (1 John ii. 18); but neither is he *the* Antichrist, whom the Advent shall destroy. Just so think Roman Catholics, when they in return designate Luther as Antichrist. DÖLLINGER (p. 438) admits, that what was perhaps said in polemical paroxysm is not really valid as the Church interpretation; and certainly ESTIUS, for example, does not say here that Luther is *the* Antichrist described by Paul, but merely that Luther learned from the devil as his master, to designate the Pope as the Antichrist. In his opinion Luther would fall under the principle expressed by him at 1 John ii. 18: *omnis hæreticus antichristus.*†—The untenableness of the Reformation references to this or that phenomenon of Church history led to various

III. *Rationalistic interpretations.* We distinguish, a. such explanations resting on the history of

* [From LUTHER's hymn:
Erhalt uns, Herr, by deinem Wort,
Und steur' des Papsts und Türken Mord, &c.—J. L.]

† [For a good statement and defence of the Protestant interpretation, see WORDSWORTH *in loc.* He gives references also to some of the earlier literature of the English Church on the same side.—J. L.]

the time as assert, that the prophecy has reference to single individuals or phenomena of the past, and was fulfilled in them or else not fulfilled; for the fulfilment can only be asserted, when the substance of the matter is eliminated from the text, and merely it most outward features are retained in a poor, dry, spiritless way. Ingenuity can be shown in this, historical erudition, and a sort of talent at combination, but the whole is paltry; the spirit of the passage is lost. It is right to recognize the fact, that the immediate reference to the Apostle's time should not be overlooked, but it is wrong to limit his word exclusively to the history of his time. The view which [HAMMOND], CLERICUS, WHITBY, SCHÖTTGEN, NÖSSELT, KRAUSE, HARDUIN support, understands by the Coming the judgment on Jerusalem, and consequently looks for the Antichrist somehow in the Jewish people. They are themselves the Antichrist (thinks WHITBY), or the Pharisees and Rabbis (SCHÖTTGEN), or the Zealots (NÖSSELT, KRAUSE), or the Highpriest Ananias, Acts xxiii. (HARDUIN), or the wicked ringleader, Simon, the son of Gioras (CLERICUS). The apostasy is understood either of the political revolt from the Romans, or of a religious falling away, or of both. The restraining power CLERICUS refers partly to the Roman governor, partly to Agrippa II. and the Jewish authorities, who disapproved of the rebellion; WHITBY and NÖSSELT, to the Emperor Claudius, who was favorable to the Jews; SCHÖTTGEN to the Christians, who by their prayers delay the catastrophe. But this limitation of the catastrophe to the Jewish people is untenable. The Coming, of which the Apostle speaks, does not concern Jerusalem merely, but likewise the Thessalonians, because it regards the whole world; nor, according to Daniel to whom Paul goes back, is the Man of Sin the Jewish people, or a party in it, or even a member of it, but a tyrant ruling all the nations of the world. This is recognized by those who by Antichrist understand a Roman Emperor; first of all by GROTIUS, who herein found Caligula, that frantic madman, who would be worshipped as the supreme God, greater than Jupiter (Suetonius, *Cal.* 22 and 23), and tried at first to bring his statue into the temple at Jerusalem (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 8)—an attempt which the prudence of Herod Agrippa I. succeeded in frustrating (comp. SCHNECKENBURGER, *Neutestam. Zeitgeschichte*, 1862, p. 41 and 212). The κατέχων is the Proconsul Vitellius, who advised against it. But even after his removal the outrage was not carried out? GROTIUS answers, that before God the will is as the deed, as in the case of adultery with the eyes. He distinguishes, finally, the ἄνομος of v. 8 from the Man of Sin of v. 3, and sees in the former Simon Magus, along with the *impius Princeps* the *impius Doctor*, who is then consumed by the appearing of Christ, to wit, in the ministry of Peter. As this last explanation is utterly capricious, so the entire combination falls to pieces, as soon as we think of the chronology: Caligula was dead at least 10 years already, before Paul even made his first visit to Thessalonica. WETSTEIN would recognize in Antichrist Titus (the mild Titus!), who caused sacrifice to be offered in the temple-site (but not himself to be worshipped!), or, in a wider sense, the Flavian house; the κατέχων being Nero, who must first be killed, and the falling away relating to the struggles of Galba, Otho, and Vitellius. Such is profane exegesis. The spirit of the passage, however, is less destroyed, when HAMMOND would find in Antichrist Simon Magus, the father of heresy, who should reveal himself, that is, cast off the mask of Christianity, when the κατέχων, to wit, the νόμος, should be set aside.* But against all these explanations may be urged the question. What is left of the *parousia* [the Advent] in the full sense of the word? They therefore tend strongly to the view that is frankly explained by saying, that there is here an expectation expressed, which long ago found its confutation in history; so especially KERN, BAUR, HILGENFELD. According to them, we are to understand by the fallling away the profligacy of the Jews, wherein Christians also shall participate, and by the mystery of wickedness the Gnostic heresy (on this point the interpretation wavers); but the Antichrist is Nero, whose coming is looked for, when the κατέχων, namely Vespasian, is removed. But that such personal severities of language towards contemporaries should be concealed in our passage has, among other objections to it, this also against it, that it is *à priori* improbable that we should find one Emperor in Antichrist, and another in the κατέχων, two individuals, therefore, of the same class. In the κατέχων we expect to perceive a power of a different order from the Man of Sin. This holds likewise against DÖLLINGER, who does not, as those last named, see in Antichrist the returning Nero (which implies a post-Pauline date of composition), but adjusts himself better to the circumstances of the time, in so far as in his view the stripling Nero stands for Antichrist, and the still reigning Claudius for the κατέχων; Nero was a devotee of magic arts, and, as he began the Jewish war, so he at least made a beginning of the profanation of the temple by the worship of the Emperors (p. 284). But this is surely a very inadequate fulfilment of v. 4; DÖLLINGER also concedes, that at the end of the days a perfect fulfilment will occur. But that the young Nero, who as yet had done nothing of so shocking a character, should have been regarded by Paul as Antichrist, and the dull Claudius, moreover, as the κατέχων (which he understands as meaning, *who is now in possession*), this too, viewed historically, is in the highest degree insufficient. Nor, finally, is it well that in the apostasy DÖLLINGER sees a misleading by the Gnostic heretics, that is entirely independent of Antichrist. b. A rationalistic speculation in the opposite direction is that of those, who, like the otherwise sound PELT and others, divest the prophecy as much as possible of everything concrete, and, retaining the general idea, explain whatever is found therein of personal features, as the dressing up of a tendency. Thus SCHNECKENBURGER also speaks of the personification of evil in its resistance to Christ. The idea then is, the climax of hostility to the gospel, prior to the Advent; but the Advent is by many regarded not as a single visible act, but as the final and general passing over of the nations to the gospel.† Previously there will occur a falling away, that is admitted, but without the biblical sharpness of conflict, and without any leading personalities. According to SCHNECKENBURGER the κατέχων should be the imperial power of Rome as the binding head of the po-

* [HAMMOND's notion is, that the temporary conformity of the Apostolic Church to the Jewish law, by appeasing Jewish hatred, delayed the opportunity for which the early heretics were watching, of stirring up persecution against the Christians.—J. L.]

† [This idea our author properly brands as rationalistic. On the contrary, very many, who pride themselves on their evangelical orthodoxy, admire it as being what they call *spiritual*.—J. L.]

itical order; according to PELT (as with THEODORET), the purpose of God, who makes use of various means; in Paul's time, of the Roman sovereignty; at all times, of that resistance to utter confusion, which proceeds even from a striving for honor and possession, or, as we might say, of conservatism; on the whole, of the better leanings of humanity, the never entirely extinct longing for salvation. The μυστήριον, &c., on the other hand, is the moral depravation already observable in Paul's time; according to SCHNECKENBURGER, Jewish sorcery, which sought entrance also amongst the heathen (Elymas, Acts xiii.; the ἀντικείμενοι πολλοί, 1 Cor. xvi. 9). To these general descriptions one can altogether assent; the neuters, τὸ κατέχον and τὸ μυστήριον, are explained satisfactorily, but ὁ κατέχων and the Antichrist are missing. Why? Because many, as LÜCKE (on 1 John), by setting aside individualities think to make the idea "more conceivable." But this interpretation damages also what is said in 1 John ii. 18 (comp. with ch. ii. 22; iv. 3; 2 John 7): "It is the last hour, in which *the* Antichrist cometh; there are even already *many* antichrists;" this does not mean: "These come *instead of* the One," but: "These come as *forerunners* of the One, the future chief personality." They show that the fulfilment draws near, already now is τὸ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου in the world" (ch. iv. 3); which answers to the μυστήριον of Paul, and is the sign of *the* Antichrist's coming. Consequently, the explanation, which sets aside the personalities plainly indicated in the words of the Apostle, tends strongly, c. to that particular rationalistic view, in which the sense of the Apostle is on the whole correctly given, but is rejected as an opinion of the time. So DE WETTE and LÜNEMANN. The former will see in the entire section nothing but a subjective outlook of the Apostle into the future of the Church, wherein he paid a tax to human weakness, in that here, as in 1 Thess. iv.; 1 Cor. xv.; Rom. xi., he wished to know too much beforehand. A fanciful interpretation of Daniel, in connection with philosophcal speculation, furnished the form. LÜNEMANN also thinks that Paul erred, as the non-fulfilment has shown, and that he was disposed to lay down more exact conclusions regarding the course of events, than it is granted to man, even when filled with the Spirit of Christ, to know. But this at bottom is nothing less than the rejection of all prophecy, in spite of an assurance like that of 1 Thess. iv. 15; and for what reason? because people proceed on a view of Daniel diametrically opposed to that of the Apostle, and on a corresponding modern speculation. At the same time, an undue stress is laid on the fact, that the expectation was not realized in the apostolic age. Therefore (LÜNEMANN) it is altogether capricious to look for the fulfilment of the prophecy only in a remote future. Others will rather find in this assertion nothing but caprice. At all events the question concerns not merely the coming of Antichrist, but the Advent of Christ Himself. If the expectation of the latter is not to be rejected for the reason that it was not realized in the Apostle's time, one cannot see why, before the yet future appearing of Christ, Antichrist also might not first appear in the future. Paul, indeed, merely hoped that it *might* happen, that he should yet live to see the coming of Christ, but nowhere does he say that it *will* be so; rather, that the times and seasons are unknown to us. If the prophecy of Immanuel (Is. vii.–ix.) is brought into connection with the chastisement by the Assyrians, without having gone into fulfilment at that time, and yet after more than 700 years Christ was the true Immanuel, why cannot the same thing occur in the case of the Advent? Comp. our remarks on 1 Thess. iv. and v.—To prove that Paul's vision does not reach beyond the horizon of his own time, an improper stress would be put on the sitting in the temple, to wit, at Jerusalem. The Lord Jesus had foretold the destruction of the temple (Matt. xxiv. 2, 15), and that, in a passage which agrees so thoroughly with Matt. xxiv., Paul should take no notice of this is the less to be assumed, when we reflect what a judgment he holds out in prospect to the Jews. But we have said already, that his words need not be pressed with so narrow a literality, as if they stood or fell with the Herodian temple. He portrays, indeed, an outward act that connects itself with the temple; but this act is the expression of an abiding disposition and purpose, that is not confined to the one house of stone. It is possible that this or a kindred act of outward pomp, and ostentation in the sanctuary, serves as an expression of self-deification. Who will see beforehand, where and in what form of outward action it will come to pass, that the Man of Sin shall force himself on all the world as God? The language of a prophet must be understood according to the analogy of the prophets.

DE WETTE, to be sure, does not scruple to assert, that, without regard to the chronological difficulty, the prediction is in itself untrue. The personification of sinfulness and ungodliness, in connection with all the forces and arts of devilish imposture, as an exact counterpart of Christ, is a contradiction, he says, to the reflective understanding as much as to pious feeling and the honor of humanity. But this is true only of that sort of reflective understanding, which first misrepresents the Scripture doctrine of the devil, as a philosopheme; which thinks, that what is said of blasphemy against the Spirit (Matt. xii.) is not to be taken according to the strictness of the letter; which indeed would be compelled in consistency to deny all actual perdition. But there is also another way of thinking which learns from Jesus, and a pious feeling which, instead of embracing ἐθελοθρησκεία, bows itself in adoration before the holy God. But as for the honor of humanity, where is it in the case of an Alexander VI., or a Marat? in the abomination of the Papacy, or the abolition of God in 1793, and the worship of a prostitute as the goddess of reason? In a word, the apostolic age is past, but the apostolic prophecy is still extant, and speaks to us with a high significance—most of all at a time, when the mystery of lawlessness is bestirring itself in greater strength than formerly.* This brings us to the view which we hold to be the true one:

IV. *The interpretation resting on the proper idea of the history of the kingdom.* Generally speaking, there is concerned in it a resumption of the patristic interpretation, avoiding the reference to single phenomena of previous Church history, observing the point of connection within the horizon of the apostolic age, and leaving open the prospect of a still impending realization of the prophetic picture. Of

* [JOWETT's improved method of emptying the prophecy of all Divine force and reality is simply a combination of several of the worst elements of the rationalistic interpretation with a "conjecture" of his own to the effect that the restrainer is "the Jewish law, the check on spiritual licentiousness which for a little while was holding in its chains the swarms of Jewish heretics, who were soon to be let loose and sweep over the earth"!—J. L.]

this view BENGEL and Roos were already the pioneers, and it is since maintained by OLSHAUSEN (who makes merely the unsuitable addition of the incarnation of Satan), HOFMANN (deducting his *Antiochus redivivus*), first in *Weissagung und Erfüllung* (II., 291 sqq.), then in *Schriftbeweis*, and lastly in the *Heil. Schrift Neuen Testaments* (I., 312 sqq.); also by LUTHARDT, BAUMGARTEN, VON GERLACH; likewise, on the whole, by HEUBNER, as in part by DÖLLINGER (at least in so far as he affirms a second and future fulfilment); then by THIERSCH (*Die Kirche im apostolischen Zeitalter*, 2d ed., 1858, p. 62 sqq., p. 139; and in the pamphlet, DÖLLINGER'S *Auffassung des Urchristenthums*, 1861, p. 88 sqq.), VON OETTINGEN (*De peccato in spiritum sanctum*, 1856, p. 156 sqq.), the Englishman ALFORD [ELLICOTT. See also my *Lectures*, pp. 507–540], and others. Let us direct our attention chiefly to three points: 1. the falling away, 2. Antichrist himself, 3. the κατέχων.

(1.) It is a momentous fact, that already in this almost the earliest Epistle Paul writes to the glorious young church about a falling away in Christendom, as Moses and the prophets did about the falling away of the people of God. For it is a falling away in Christendom that he intends, a reaction against its general extension. Thus Joel, Isaiah (ch. xxvii.), Ezekiel (ch. xxxviii.), Psalms ii. and cx., foretell a judgment on all nations, and so do Jesus and His Apostles the rise of false prophets who should deceive many, a grievous diffusion of the ungodly, worldly spirit; comp. Matt. xxiv. 10 sqq.; John v. 43; 1 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Tim. iii. 1; Acts xx. 29, 30; Jude and 1 Pet. ii.; 1 and 2 John, and the Revelation. A prelude to this Paul had witnessed in Thessalonica itself. The Old Testament teaches the comprehension of the revolters under one enemy of God as their head only, perhaps, in Ps. cx. 6 * and with peculiar distinctness in Daniel; in the New Testament this is done in our text and in Revelation. The expression ἀντίχριστος is found only in the First and Second Epistles of John. But in our passage the falling away is by no means identical with the Antichrist (as the Fathers understood it), or even merely (as DE WETTE thinks) the working exclusively of Antichrist; rather, the general rush of violent departure from the faith precedes that final disclosure of the Antichristian despot. THIERSCH: The abomination in the holy place, which introduces the judgment on Jerusalem, is the type of that desecration of the Church, which invokes the judgment by Antichrist, and soon also upon him. OLSHAUSEN and HOFMANN are correct in stating, that in the time of the Maccabees faithless Jews broke the covenant, prior to the raging of Antiochus; they then sided with the tyrant, whereas the Lord's people took courage, and many actually died as martyrs. BENGEL reminds us that in the gospel likewise there is first a proclamation, that the kingdom has come nigh, and then the King himself comes forward. Thus it is only in the later periods of the Old and New Testaments, that the concentration of evil in a single head is plainly taught, but not as an isolated, peculiar opinion, but as a recapitulation. Answerable, that is, to the apostasy spreading ever more widely, and springing from it, is

(2.) The Man of Sin, the ripest fruit of his time, the consummate product of evil; not so much a false prophet, as WIESELER imagines, as the Godless, self-deifying ruler of worldly empire. The abominable worship of the Emperors, to which so many were enslaved, was a serious foretaste of this. Vainglorious falsehood, seduction, blasphemy, are the characteristics of this being. In every worldly empire a tendency to apotheosis had been observable (Nebuchadnezzar, Alexander); of this current Paul notes the shameless consummation. Why should it be "more conceivable," that in this last empire the personal climax should be omitted, which was wanting in none of its predecessors? In all history there exists a reciprocity of action between the actual movement of the time and the achievements of an energetic personality. For every historical individual there is a thousand-fold work of preparation, and he makes his appearance not otherwise than as a child of his age. And again the drift of the time only reaches an irresistible supremacy, when one man conceives the spirit of the time at its height, with bold grasp brings to bear what is fermenting half obscurely in a thousand minds, and so stamps the age with his seal. He can do it, if he has the courage—after all, it will be the effrontery—to express and carry out what is in a thousand hearts. Those who were his forerunners then become his servants and helpers.

Of course, we do not yet know himself, the future head; a prolepsis there was again, when many were disposed to see in Napoleon I. more than a type of him. But that the apostasy is advancing in Christendom, who can hide from himself? It is important to attend to this, in opposition to an overvaluing of the outward Christianity of the popular life and that of states. Faithfulness in little and the least, the thankful administration of what is still entrusted to us, will not be weakened in the smallest degree, if we hold less to an untenable ideal. But of this character is the opinion, that the development of the kingdom of God advances on the smooth and level road of "progress" in what is good, and that the question is about the easy and brilliant "transfiguration of the world" [*Weltverklärung*] by means of Christian culture.* On the contrary, the prospect held out to us rather is, that in the last severe conflict evil will even obtain an outward victory, as over Christ on Good Friday, but shall then be destroyed by the Lord Himself. It is well worth while to give heed to the prophetic word, and that so much the more, as the day comes nearer; not throwing it into the shade with a shrug of the shoulder, as if it were a matter of fanaticism. Paul himself would have us prudently try the spir-

* [מָחַץ רֹאשׁ, "He has smitten the *head*."—J. L.]

* [This very familiar but plainly unscriptural delusion was recently asserted with characteristic frankness by America's most popular preacher in the following terms (see the New York *Independent*, May 31, 1866):

"The last period is that which has just come. I know not whether the second advent of Christ is at hand, or not. I know not even what the meaning of it is. That there is to be a literal visit of Christ to the earth again they may believe who are wedded to physical interpretations of Scripture. I do not so read the Word of God. But that there is to be a power of Christ upon the earth that may be fitly called His second coming; that the world is to be so filled with His glory that no man shall have occasion to say to his fellow-men, 'Know the Lord,' because all shall know Him, from the greatest to the least; and that there is to be a new heaven and a new earth, in which dwell righteousness, I do profoundly believe. I believe in a glorious period of development, that is to make the world's history as bright as noonday. What it may be, I know not; and how near we may be to it, I know not. The signs of the times are auspicious, and they all point in one way." Comp. 1 Thess. v. 3 and Ez. xiii. 10–16.—J. L.]

ta, and hold fast our νοῦς. But the same thing holds good also of watchfulness, that we be not befooled by the fanaticism of reason, intoxicated with the giddy potion of the great words of philosophers and poets, nor suffer our sensibility to be dulled, till it is no longer wounded by any blasphemy. We refer the reader to the earnest words against the false boast of the world's glorification by Christian culture, instead of by the cross and regeneration, in AUBERLEN'S *Daniel*, 2d ed., p. 234 sqq., 239, 264. On p. 261 it is said: We are not to suppose that during the present dispensation Christianity will ever, or is meant to, succeed in Christianizing the world in a true and proper sense. An ameliorating influence it may and probably will exert on all the departments of life; but a proper glorification must necessarily be preceded by a regeneration, that is, by death and resurrection; in this way it behooved even Christ Himself to be glorified. In accordance with this HEUBNER says (p. 177): However the delicate and tender-hearted may shudder at the idea of such a degenerate, atheistical, as it were devilish, generation, yet according to the course of things it is probably what we have to expect. In humanity good and evil go forward parallel to each other (Matt. xiii. 30). As the culture of the understanding, science and art increase, man attains greater opportunity on the one side for improvement, but on the other also for deterioration.—In truth, we can trace more and more of this μυστήριον ἤδη ἐνεργούμενον: a widespread, daring, fundamental unbelief; a more and more conscious hatred of the Divine; even in the better class of spirits a deep, gnawing scepticism, that undermines the lowermost foundations of Divine and human truth and authority; thus little holds its ground in the consciousness unmolested as sacred, as was formerly the case even with rude transgressors; all piety is with many utterly shaken, and revolt elevated to a principle; to this is added the worship of genius, the emancipation of the flesh, the arrogance of rule over nature, a coarse self-deification. As a single instance, we may note the proclamation of Napoleon I. in Egypt, cited by MENZEL in his *Die letzten* 120 *Jahre der Weltgeschichte*, II. 375. And how widely is this spread! How strongly does history tend to the result, that everything should assume the dimensions of a world-empire! Hindoos often nowadays despise, along with the idols of their fathers, the living God, and devour the productions of German and English infidelity, etc. Nor is it on slight grounds that a feeling is so widely spread as is that of uneasiness, yea, of horror, at the volcano fermenting in the depths of society.

One must be wilfully blind, to see in our populations nothing but an ill-understood bent of aspiration after Christianity in a more human form. Let us according to our ability become all things to all men (1 Cor. ix. 22); let us change our voice (Gal. iv. 20), in order if possible to gain some by new methods. But do not let us forget, that he alone finds entrance to the faith, and to the clear, bright intelligence of faith, who does not disdain the strait gate of μετάνοια. But our testimony may give place to that of others, and, before all, of DE WETTE, who in the Preface to his exposition of the Apocalypse holds different language from that in his exegesis of the Thessalonian Epistle. There, under the impressions of the year 1848, he says, p. vi: "I could not help seeing in our time, though in a different outward form and in yet darker colors, the Antichrist depicted by John. The self-deification of Antichrist appears to me child's play, compared with the God-denying, unbelieving, arrogant egotism of our day, with its rejection of all restraint; and what is a material persecution of the Christian faith with fire and sword, compared with the destructive dialectics of Young Hegelianism, or with the flattering speech and infatuation of the so-called love of freedom, which springs from the worst inward bondage, and is leading the poor people to a bondage both inward and outward? According to the counsel of those who pretend to stand at the head of the culture of the time, and whose claim to that effect passes current, the State should rid itself of Christian principle, and take up its position on the ground of indifference, if not even of atheism. What a progress—to a new and hitherto unexampled barbarism!" That, indeed, we have no reason to be excessively amazed at this, LUTHARDT asserts (p. 149), that, however much Christianity may come to be the world's religion, and even gather the remotest barbarians within the pale of the Church, the future that lies before us is the complete inward estrangement of the masses from the Christian faith, and finally their open apostasy. And VON GERLACH expresses himself thus: In our days there has actually been made a beginning of a worship, in which humanity is deified and adored; and the complete dissolution of the Christian Church into the kingdoms of this world is already expected by many. For, say these errorists, the State is the only form in which the infinitude of reason, freedom, and the highest blessings of the human spirit in reality exists, and no higher fortune can befall religion and the Church, than that they should essentially coöperate with this phenomenon of the reason, and stand forth as institutions of the State.—THE SAME: Assaults on the foundations of the Christian faith, more comprehensive and of deeper reach than ever before occurred—assaults, which notwithstanding their folly meet with the greatest applause amongst those whom the god of this world has blinded—these are signs of the appearing of the Antichrist, such as never existed in the times of Papal power.—[ALFORD: "If it be said, that this is somewhat a dark view to take of the prospects of mankind, we may answer, first, that we are not speculating on the phenomena of the world, but we are interpreting God's word: secondly, that we believe in One in whose hands all evil is working for good,—with whom there are no accidents nor failures,—who is bringing out of all this struggle, which shall mould and measure the history of the world, the ultimate good of man and the glorification of His boundless love in Christ: and thirdly, that no prospect is dark for those who believe in Him. For them all things are working together for good; and in the midst of the struggle itself, they know that every event is their gain; every apparent defeat, real success; and even the last dread conflict, the herald of that victory, in which all who have striven on God's part shall have a glorious and everlasting share."—J. L.]—It is of great importance, that without any faint-hearted anxiety, or hasty restlessness, or censoriousness, we should yet have our senses exercised to discern what—sometimes under a fair show, sometimes shamelessly enough—is not merely unchristian, but antichristian. We shall be so much the more thankful if at any time we fall in with the hindering, restraining power. That is, indeed, the obscurest point in the interpretation; the question, namely:

(3.) What is the *κατέχον*? who the *κατέχων*?

It must at any rate be a *beneficent* force, which only according as God permits, prevails, or is taken out of the way, or, when He recalls it, retires; a power it must be, which already during Paul's lifetime was working (*ἄρτι*), and is still to-day working, since the Antichrist is, indeed, not yet present. Two leading interpretations at once present themselves: it is either a political power that is seen here (with the majority of the Fathers), or (with other expositors) one of a religious nature. The former view (in TERTULLIAN, *De Resurr.* 24: *Romanus status*) is adopted by many Protestants and Catholics, who think that in the Apostle's time the Roman Empire was to be understood by the neuter, and its ruler by the masculine. Paul knew by repeated experience, even in Thessalonica itself, that the Roman Government had a beneficent side (Acts xvii. 9; xviii. 14 sqq.; xxi. 32; &c.; comp. Rom. xiii.). By means of the protection of law and its established political order it not merely suppressed lawlessness and sedition, but it afforded also to the gospel, by its rigorous resistance to Jewish malignity, a certain degree of shelter and opportunity. Daniel likewise had a similar experience of worldly power. By this method, however, it is rather the meaning merely of *τὸ κατέχον* that is cleared up, not so much that of *ὁ κατέχων*. The latter would have to be the Emperor existing at any time prior to the final Antichristian Regent. But wicked, in some cases most ungodly rulers, like Caligula, or even like Claudius, could scarcely appear to the Apostle as representatives of the power that still hinders the full outburst of evil. Even those less wicked were too much alike in quality to the bad men, in whom was exhibited the *μυστήριον ἤδη ἐνεργούμενον*. HOFMANN says with reason, that certainly amongst the evil Emperors, who ruled in Paul's time, it could not but be particularly manifest, that not men, but only a superhuman power, still checked the outbreak of utter wickedness. WIESELER also insists on the idea, that what hinders the outbreak of consummate ungodliness must be something good, and the supporter of what is good. OLSHAUSEN would make the distinction, that the same Emperors might have been personally types of Antichrist, and in their official position representatives of law, and so *κατέχοντες*; but this is certainly too refined and artificial.

If, therefore, we try the other view, which sees in the *κατέχων* a religious power, the perplexity becomes almost greater still, whether we say (with KOPPE, SCHOTT, HEYDENREICH and others), that the *κατέχων* is Paul with his intercession; or (with ZWINGLI, DIEDRICH, GRIMM in the *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1850, iv.), the Apostles generally, their fidelity, and vigilance, and spiritual power; or (with CALVIN), the proclamation of the gospel; or (with SCHÖTTGEN), the intercessory Church. In the latter case, the masculine singular would be strange; might that perhaps be Christ? but how would this agree with *ἐκ μέσου γενέσθαι*? it is just after the brief tyranny of Antichrist that He is to appear to judgment; or Christ in them (Col. i. 27), the young spirit of the Christian cause (BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS)? But if that withdrew altogether, there would no longer be any Church; and the Church cannot be taken out of the way before the appearance of Antichrist; it is impossible that the Antichrist should not come till *after* the Church is removed; for that which, not perhaps hinders his outbreak, but rather excites his wrath, is just the Church itself, which he persecutes, without being able to set it aside. Even the Irvingite reference to the company of the chosen ones, which should be caught away before the coming of Antichrist, is thoroughly untenable; that whole doctrine would have to be previously established, as is not the case, to make the reference of *the κατέχων* to that company even at all plausible.

If, however, we limit the import of the expression *ὁ κατ.* to a small part of the Church, or even to a member of it, the removal of the same becomes indeed conceivable, but there arises a new difficulty. If, for example, we were to suppose Paul to have meant himself by it, we could not, indeed, pronounce it *à priori* impossible that he should have ascribed so great an influence to his apostolic intercession in restraining the revelation of Antichrist; but it is impossible that he should have said to the Thessalonians: I am the *κατέχων*, and I must first *ἐκ μέσου γενέσθαι*. The latter phrase cannot be referred merely to his imprisonment, since his intercession would still not have been terminated thereby; it would have to be understood of his death, and then it is no longer intelligible how he could have said here: Antichrist does not come, till I am dead; whereas in 1 Thess. iv. and 1 Cor. xv. he says: I regard it as possible that I may live till the Advent. And besides, whether we take Paul or the Apostles in general, they died, and the Antichrist did not come. This holds likewise against the interpretation of WIESELER, who seeks the *κατέχων* in Jerusalem, where also the session in the temple should occur. He understands by it the pious in Jerusalem collectively, or, if it must be an individual, then James the Just, who was called the bulwark of the people* (Hegesippus, in Eusebius's *Church History*, ii. 23). Now James too died, and Antichrist came not. But to say nothing of the mistake, which we are not without reason to charge on the Apostle, it is likewise *à priori* unimaginable, that Paul should have spoken to the Thessalonians of James alone in a way which we should find scarcely conceivable as coming from the Jewish Christians, by whom the latter was regarded with an extravagant veneration.

Thus it seems that we are driven back on the first explanation, which understands *τὸ κατέχον* as the shelter and protection of the authority, at that time of the Roman, but still even now of essentially the same power; thus, in the judgment also of LANGE (*Positive Dogmatik*, p. 1270): It is the old social order, Church and State, the latter especially, Rom. xiii.; and, on the Catholic side, of LUTTERBECK (*Neutest. Lehrbegriffe*, II. 231): It is every orderly power in the world. In the same sense LUTHARDT says (p. 157 sqq.): In the doctrine of antichristianity, as being the issue of worldly power, there would be for Christians a danger of putting themselves in thought, and perhaps also in outward conduct, in a false relation to public life and to the rulers of the civil commonwealth, did there not stand alongside of it the other doctrine, that in the civil order the will of God is fulfilled, and a blessed force has sway. Therefore also the Apostle enjoins subjection to the higher powers, as the Divinely appointed guardians of justice (Rom. xiii.), and that prayer be made for them, that through them the Church may enjoy quiet and dwell safely (1 Tim. ii. 2; comp. 1 Pet. ii. 13 sqq.). In the present consciousness of Christians,

* [That being the import of his other name *Oblias*, from עָם עֹפֶל.—J. L.]

moreover, there is scarcely anything more certain than this, that the moral and legal order is a Divine dike, which at present still holds back the floods of a gloomy abyss, and who knows for how long? For it is the spirit of ungodliness, which declares itself also in the subversion of the order of human law. And thus it will be the moral forces of the natural life, which the Apostle understood to be that check upon ungodliness.—This appears to us to be a perfectly sufficient explanation of what *τὸ κατέχον* is; but *ὁ κατέχων*? how is this power to be comprehended in a single masculine subject? We saw how far it is from being satisfactory even for the Apostle's time, to find this subject in any Roman Emperor of that period.

Ewald, who feels the necessity of recognizing here, not merely, with Wieseler, a good, but, with Hofmann, a supernatural power, has proposed an explanation of his own; that what is spoken of is nothing else but the expected return of Elijah, who is at present still in heaven, but, when he comes, will withstand the Antichrist, so that the latter will not reach his full power, until Elijah is removed (Matt. xvii. 11; Rev. xi. 3-12). There is thus an *Elias redivivus*, as with Hofmann an *Antiochus redivivus*, only that Hofmann himself seriously believes in the latter. But, looked at closely, it is untenable that even Paul himself should have thought of Elijah. For how could the tarrying of Elijah in heaven be described as the *κατέχον*, and Elijah himself, who must first come, as the very *κατέχων ἄρτι*? That must be a personage who was already working, while Paul was alive.

Who he is, has been best shown by Hofmann (already in *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, etc.), and he is joined by Luthardt, Baumgarten, Auberlen (*Daniel*, 67), Von Oettingen. He starts with this idea, that since Paul appeals to his oral instruction, which, so far as the Antichrist is concerned, unquestionably rested on Daniel, it is to be expected that we shall best find in the same source the solution also of the *κατέχων*; and so it is too in fact. In Dan. x. 5, 13, 20 an angel prince says to Daniel: "I withstood the prince of Persia;"* that is not the human king; v. 13 shows that there is a distinction made between the מַלְכֵי פָּרַס and the superhuman prince, שַׂר מַלְכוּת פָּרַס; but an evil spirit is meant, who tries to incite the king of Persia to evil, and to whom the good angel has offered successful resistance. This good angel, therefore, is in Persia *ὁ κατέχων*, who strengthens whatever there is of *τὸ κατέχον*, and disposes the Persian king to treat with kindness the people of God. It is the good spirit, still active in the worldly power of heathenism. In the Greek empire, he intimates, he will no longer have this influence; there, to use Paul's phrase, he will have to *ἐκ μέσου γενέσθαι*, quit the field, and then this will be followed by the coming of the Old Testament Antichrist (Antiochus). The very same prospect Paul holds out for the period of the Christian Church: through the conservative action of a good spirit opportunity is given for the Spirit of Christ; when the former is compelled to withdraw, then will Antichrist come. Indeed, we speak also of the spirit of a time, in a good as well as a bad sense, meaning thereby a prevailing, or, so to speak, epidemic force, mightier than any individual; only we understand it as impersonally, anonymously, as in a neuter form, whereas Scripture adds to this the masculine, and shows us in the background of individual and national life a struggle of good and evil powers of a real and personal kind. It is obvious that this conflict of the two principles—on the one side the mystery of ungodliness, and, on the other, the restraining force—is the soul of history. It were a great matter to bring the lovers of truth to a consciousness of this; that they should no longer be satisfied with talking in a mere empty, formal way about progress, but bethink themselves: Progress—whither? *Let both grow together! until the harvest!*

[By the *κατέχον* and *κατέχων* Alford understands respectively "the *fabric of human polity*, and *those who rule that polity*, by which the great upbursting of godlessness is kept down and hindered." —Ellicott inclines to the view which refers *τὸ κατέχον* to "the restraining power of *well-ordered human rule*, the principles of *legality* as opposed to those of *ἀνομία*—of which the Roman Empire was the then embodiment and manifestation," and on the change of gender to the masculine he remarks: "Perhaps the simplest view is to regard it, not as a studied designation of a single individual (*e. g.* St. Paul, Schott, p. 249), or of a collection of such (*e. g.* the saints at Jerusalem, Wieseler, *Chronol.*, p. 273, or, more plausibly, the succession of Roman Emperors, Wordsworth), but merely as a *realistic* touch, by which what was previously expressed by the more abstract *τὸ κατέχον* is now, as it were, represented as concrete and personified; comp. Rom. xiii. 4, where the personification is somewhat similarly introduced after, and elicited from a foregoing abstract term (*ἐξουσίαν*)."—J. L.]

(4.) (Vv. 9-12.) If false prophets can work miracles, as did the Egyptian magicians, it is evident that miracles alone do not prove a cause to be Divine; rather, they themselves need confirmation, in order to become in their turn demonstrative signs. Already in Deut. xiii. it is announced that there may be wonders wherein a temptation lurks; if they aim at misleading to idolatry, the honest Israelite is to know what to think about them. And so with the powers of a Simon (Acts viii.) or Elymas (Acts xiii.). In these cases it is impossible for us accurately to determine how much is idle jugglery, and how much real power of a baneful sort, nor is it required that we should so determine. When we perceive the criminal object in view, we should restrain ourselves from meddling with the matter. There is an unwholesome impulse to fall in with everything that has merely some show of the wonderful and extraordinary; we should understand that such a spirit may open the door to the Antichristian delusion. It is unskilful apologetics, that in this merely outward way would found on the supernatural the argument for the Divine. But it is not less mistaken, to reject altogether the evidence of miracles. What is obvious to common sense is stated by Jesus in express words, Matt. xi. 5, 20-24; John x. 25; xiv. 10, 11; xv. 24 (over against ch. iv. 48, and similar texts), and so by the Apostle, 2 Cor. xii. 12 (over against 1 Cor. i. 22), namely, that we should have regard to Divine signs. To demand signs in wilful conceit is a perverse thing; but to disregard the signs which God vouchsafes is not less improper. Of those that are really given by God the convincing power lies in the harmony of the inward with the outward; on the one side, the powers of a higher order, which, healing and helpful, penetrate the death-life [1 Tim

* [Literally: "The prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me."—J. L.]

v. 6]; on the other, an impress of holiness, which attests itself simply and clearly to the conscience. In the agreement of these two sides there is a strength of evidence, which neither the one nor the other possesses apart; and in what is called in John [xvii. 4] the work of Christ the two sides are thoroughly combined. That the wonder-worker is a holy man of God, lies in the foundation of our trust in him. We judge the matter by the rule which God has planted in our conscience, not by one that we have made for ourselves. For this reason also, far from exalting ourselves above him, we bow in his presence. The want of this stamp of holiness would be a warning to us against a deceiver. And again, on the other hand, an individual, in whom we recognize the energy of sanctification, may probably be of service to us in the powerful edification and furtherance of our inner life. But without the power of extending a healing virtue likewise into our outer life, and guaranteeing to us a future perfection of life, the Saviour would still not be a complete Saviour. The work of Divine redemption must not be reduced to the proportions of a human tragedy.

(5.) The contrast between truth and unrighteousness is of frequent occurrence (Rom. i. 18; 1 Cor. xiii. 6; comp. John iii. 20, 21). Though at first sight it appears to be not altogether valid, yet it proves to be very striking, when the inward development is examined. Whoever seeks satisfaction in sin and loves unrighteousness, thereby suppresses the truth of God which might germinate within him. With the truth, the question would be, to seek God and His righteousness,—to discern the way in which we are delivered from evil, and enabled to do well; but whoever cleaves to unrighteousness, in his case the uncleanness of the will is the beginning also of the obscuration of the intelligence, which thus becomes enslaved to falsehood. And inversely, for becoming righteous, for regeneration and sanctification, the first beginning is nothing else but in hearkening to the truth, yielding to the truth, submitting to be reproved by the truth. The man who pauses, and from a desire to see how he stands before God comes to the light, attains with this knowledge to the beginning of a change of mind. Only in him, who allows this love for the truth to be aroused within him, can the truth itself take effect, and become a power for righteousness.—RIEGER: There is in the truth, as in the natural light, something lovely, delightful, comforting. In nothing has man so great a satisfaction as in the truth. But, of course, it comes with us into conflict with other violent tendencies. Truth, and faith therein, are obstructed by man's evil desires, by the pleasure he takes in unrighteousness, and by his impatience of being reproved by the light. And where the truth is not received into the love of the heart, there also it exerts no saving power. Only in the love of the heart can the truth take root, and bear fruit. But the truth does not force itself against their will on those who despise it. God knows how, in connection with the truth, to regard also His own honor, and maintains His reserve. At first a man takes matters easily with respect to the truth and to being misled into error; he trifles with both, does not yield to the truth his heart's love, but thinks that neither shall the error and the deception overmaster him. Behind error, however, lurks a power that is perilous to every one who is not armed with love for the truth.—ROOS: They who perish have had the saving truth, but they received not the love of the truth. One cannot love the truth without believing it, nor can one believe it without loving it. It is certain, and should therefore be believed; it is beautiful, lovely, consistent, salutary, containing most excellent things, and should therefore be loved. But the world loves it not, but makes its greatest boast of the fact, that it still tolerates or endures it; whereas it is only of that which is evil that we say that it is tolerated or endured, to wit, when we cannot or are not disposed to prevent or exterminate it. Truth, on the contrary, should be loved, not tolerated. But there can be no greater unrighteousness than this, to take delight in inventing, reading, hearing, and still further propagating doubts against the sure, true, dear and precious word of God. The end of such must be, to believe the lie.

(6.) Does God Himself send an energy of delusion? The Greek Fathers thought this too harsh, and softened the expression by taking the sending for a bare permission; but improperly. Our fathers of the Reformation especially insisted on recognizing the will of God as powerfully active even in judgments of this kind. Already in the Old Testament He sends evil spirits (1 Sam. xvi. 13 sqq.; 1 Kings xxii. 22); to wit, for the punishment of sin by sin (comp. Rom. i. 24 sqq.). He is the holy God, and therefore is never the first Author of evil; but the evil that already exists He turns to His own holy ends. He does not produce in the heart falsehood and wickedness; but where they are already in the heart, there He puts a lying spirit in the mouth of the false prophets. From the corrupt seed that is in the heart he brings forth this fruit, that it serves His purpose. Thou art to have thy will, and reap what thou hast sown. This judgment is never a faint, impotent permission, but a powerful operation, though to the last with a salutary aim (Rom. xi. 32); only in cases where the period of grace is trifled away, does it issue in irreclaimable obduracy (Matt. xiii. 14, 15). But even the rebel must in his way, since he would not otherwise, serve the gracious counsel of God. Frequently an evil is for a long while not yet manifest as such; it lies dormant, it lurks in ambush, its consequences have not yet broken forth. The power of delusion is so much the more effective, when truth and falsehood are mingled, and interesting individuals defend this mixture; even that which is worst can adorn itself with a fair seeming, and with plausible words deceive the hearts of the simple (Rom. xvi. 18). The exhortation is: Take heed, and turn from them; and the promise: The God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet. This He does especially even by means of that judicial manifestation of the evil fruit. His action over against the free creature consists in the mere solicitation of its freedom. This proceeds from God; but it is in man's power to say yes or no to it.* Thus faith is

* [*Sein Thun gegenüber der freien Kreatur besteht in lauter Sollicitiren der Freiheit; von Gott geht es aus, der Mensch aber kann es bejahen oder verneinen*—an unguarded statement, I should say, and itself an undue softening of the plain representations of Scripture in regard to man's spiritual bondage and helplessness. True enough, our fallen nature, which now says No to God, still retains the very same faculty of will with which it was originally endowed for the purpose of saying Yes. But, perverted and paralysed by sin, it has never yet in any single instance since the fall said Yes, and in no single future instance will it make that response, except as, not merely *solicited*, but renewed, strengthened, and enabled by Divine grace. What, then, is the value of that figment of ability to please God, which, owing to the absolute and universal conditions of the case, brings forth only fruit unto death (Rom. vii. 5)? And how much better is it than inability?—J. L.]

the work of God, and yet also that which God requires; and so the hardening of the sinner is described sometimes as the act of God, at other times as the act of man. Of immense significance, moreover, and justice, is this form of judgment, that they who would not believe the truth must believe the lie. How many, who cry out against an implicit faith, when the Bible is in question, are ignominiously enslaved by an implicit faith over against anonymous journalists! How many, who in opposition to the word of God have nothing but unbelief, sink down into disgraceful superstition towards somnambulists, fortune-tellers, and rapping tables! Already CHRYSOSTOM remarks, that they who said: *Since there is but one God, we could not believe in the divinity of Christ*, are deprived by Antichrist of all excuse. And in our day, they who believe not that an almighty, wise God created the universe, do believe (for they have not seen it) that chance whirled together the atoms; and they, who believe not that Jesus changed the water into wine, do believe that the unconscious power of nature transformed the ape into a man. This collier's faith of unbelief is a judgment. Before all the world must it be made manifest, that the motive of their unbelief was not a noble protest against a dependence unworthy of the spirit, but pleasure in unrighteousness. Verily, they too believe; only they would not believe in the holy truth of God; and therefore their punishment is, that their need of faith squanders itself on the most pitiful vanities. That which we already now see of this sort is a foretaste of what is coming. [ALFORD: *God is sending* must not for a moment be understood of *permissiveness* only on God's part—He is the judicial sender and doer—it is He who hardens the heart which has chosen the evil way. All such distinctions are the merest folly: whatever God *permits*, He *ordains*.—ELLICOTT: The words are definite and significant; they point to that judicial infatuation, . . . into which, in the development of His just government of the world, God causes evil and error to be unfolded, and which He brings into punitive agency in the case of all obstinate and truth-hating rejection of His offers and calls of mercy.—*Lectures:* According to our Apostle, this child of hell comes to execute on earth a judicial, punitive, Divine mission. Paul does not say, that God compels any man to believe in Him; but he does say that, in lifting the veil that hides the Antichrist, one of God's designs is to begin to avenge the wrong already done to "the truth," by showing that in the free, spontaneous exercise of a depraved nature, the wilful despisers of His own saving grace will yield ready credence to the lie of the cruel and treacherous Blasphemer.—*The same:* The whole, then, is just as if it had been said: Men hate the truth, which God sends to them for their salvation, and even refuse to be reconciled to it. He then and therefore, instead of destroying them at once, takes measures to bring out all the sin and madness of their hearts; and this, in order to their being ultimately brought into judgment, when He shall be justified in His speaking, and shall be clear in His judging (Eccl. xi. 9; Ps. li. 4). In other words, God's purpose is, by means of an extreme manifestation of human wickedness, to draw forth and vindicate the declaration of the Divine judgment. "When judged," says Augustine (*de Civ. Dei*, xx. 19. 4)—judged, that is, for rejecting the truth—"when judged, they shall be seduced; and when seduced, they shall be judged."—J. L.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

V. 1. The glory of Jesus and our glorification are most intimately connected. Now already the union with Jesus begins within; it will one day break forth also outwardly, and be thenceforth without hindrance.—Who can think highly enough of the Christian's calling! Who can be faithful enough in that which is least!

[BURKITT: At the day of judgment there shall be both a congregation and a segregation.—M. HENRY: Christ the great centre of their unity. They shall be gathered together *to Him* to be *attendants on Him*, to be *assessors with Him*, to be *presented by Him* to the Father, to be *with Him* for ever, and altogether happy in His presence to all eternity.—THE SAME: The doctrine of Christ's coming, and our gathering together to Him, is of great moment and importance to Christians; otherwise it would not be the proper matter of the Apostle's obtestation.—*Lectures:* How much and how earnestly were the Apostles and their churches occupied about the coming of the day of God! Can we persuade ourselves that it is any improvement on their habits, that we scarcely ever think about it at all, but have taken to making the best of the present evil world? —J. L.]

V. 2. ZWINGLI: True Christians do not suffer themselves to be frightened by idle alarms, knowing that they are reconciled to God, whether they live or die.—If we cannot but be frightened, that is a sign, that we are not standing in the full spirit of discipleship. Art thou prepared?—But only God's grace in Christ can take away completely all terror from the heart.—LUTHARDT: Let the Lord come by day or by night, when He does come, that is His day.—Divine truth, even when most clearly delivered, can easily be misunderstood. The duty of the teacher is, as far as possible to remove the misconception.—HEUBNER: The Christian must exercise a holy criticism.—ROOS: On this false notion (that the day of Christ is present) there would have arisen divisions amongst true Christians; some would have regarded it as important and necessary, others as futile.—Wherever there is an awakening from the sleep of [spiritual] death [Eph. v. 14], there is very apt to be a mingling of flesh and spirit.

Vv. 1, 2. To gaze from earth away towards heaven, and to turn away from heaven to earth—both may be wrong, and both right (comp. Acts i.). The certainty, that the Lord cometh, must never withdraw us from present duty.

[ALFORD: Every expression of the ages before us, betokening close anticipation, coupled with the fact that the day has not yet arrived, teaches us much, but unteaches us nothing: does not deprive that glorious hope of its applicability to our times, nor the Christian of his power of living as in the light of his Lord's approach, and the daily realization of the day of Christ.—J. L.]

V. 3. [LEIGHTON: He seems not to assert any great tract of time to intervene, but only that in that time great things were first to come.—J. L.]—CALVIN: Christ also warns His disciples to prepare themselves for severe conflicts. When the Church is torn in pieces, we are not to be frightened as by something unexpected. The Church must first fall into horrid ruin, before it is fully re-established. How useful is this prophecy! One might otherwise think: This cannot surely be the building of God (it being so wasted); or others might say: Christ can

not so grievously abandon His bride (and find in this a pretext for all corruptions).—The preparation and warning close with the promise of victory.—RIEGER: God allows the evil free course, and scope for further development. The loss, which His glory thus seems for a time to suffer, He again makes good by judgments, and meanwhile His time of patience becomes salvation to many others.

Vv. 3, 4. DIEDRICH: The Man of Sin will make Adam's sin his very religion, and will glorify sin. This can only be an apostate Christian, a consummate Judas.—*Berl. Bib.:* These things always follow one upon the other: Apostasy in Christianity, and an absurd, mad throne of government for the punishment of the previous folly, which imposed the yoke on itself.

V. 5. CALVIN: How forgetful are men, when their eternal salvation is in question!—Hence the need of their being ever anew reminded of what has been said—of an ever-fresh watering of that which has been planted.—CHRYSOSTOM connects with this verse a very impressive exhortation to the right hearing of the word.

V. 6. Nor can wickedness come at its own will, but only at the set time assigned to it by God. The servant is not above his master (Luke xxii. 53).

V. 7. HEUBNER: Wickedness is a mystery: 1. The origin of evil is a mystery, and hides in the dark; so with 2. its connections, and the means which it employs; 3. its progress; and 4. its tendency.—At present the mystery of lawlessness is stirring more strongly than formerly.

V. 8. ROOS: Antichrist, indeed, is coming, but Christ also comes behind him. Therefore let no man's heart fail him, who is concerned for the honor of Christ's cause.—*Berl. Bib.:* The strong one can be opposed only by One stronger than he.—CALVIN: God exhorts His people to patience, because it is only for a little while that He afflicts His Church.—*Berl. Bib.:* Supposing that Antichrist and all his adherents were brought under (subdued),* what would it avail us, if we have an antichrist in our own body?

V. 9. DIEDRICH: The whole being of Antichrist comes from falsehood; falsehood is all that he does; and again the object of the whole is likewise to promote falsehood.

V. 10. DIEDRICH: Whoever does not, like Paul, seek for truth above all things, but is bent on gold and honor and the friendship of the world, has come under the power of the devil, and serves Antichrist to his own steadily advancing and utter ruin.—The truth itself excites love for the truth, but does not force it.—STÄHELIN: Oh that we had but a greater horror of the Antichristian abominations, prayed more fervently for the poor, misled people, and made use of the truth for ourselves in a more thankful and devout spirit!

V. 11. STOCKMEYER: All unrighteousness is a lie; in promising man satisfaction, it lies.—DIEDRICH: The just God rules also in this, that contempt for His pure, saving truth must be punished thus (by belief in falsehood).—RIEGER: God's word and our own conscience sufficiently assure us, that God has no share in what is evil; and yet He can employ the agency of evil spirits and evil men for the attainment of His purposes.—[The reader is referred to two admirable Discourses of SOUTH on this verse: "Ill-disposed *affections*, both naturally and penally the cause of darkness and error in the *judgment*."—J. L.]

V. 12.—ROOS: To doubt, deny, start objections, and be indifferent to all the articles of the Christian faith, such is the reigning fashion; but hereafter people will believe lies.—STOCKMEYER: To love sin, and concoct for one's self a righteousness that is nothing but unrighteousness whitewashed, this is to block up the way of truth.—THE SAME: Wherever the truth reaches, it effects a separation; judgment is separation, κρίσις.—CALVIN: When he says *all*, he intimates that contempt for God will not be excused by the great multitude of those who refuse to obey the gospel. God is the Judge of all the world, and can just as well inflict punishment on a hundred thousand, as on one individual.

Vv. 1-12. HEUBNER: What practical value has this prophecy of Paul for us?

1. It affords us important instruction on the nature of the human heart, and also on the nature of Christianity. Our race is in a state of corruption, which must still more and more develop itself; this must fill us with shame and humiliation. But Christianity, because it contains the strongest antidote to the evil, for that very reason stirs up the evil spirit, and excites it to its most strenuous efforts; these, however, the Lord Himself will bring to naught. No religion has so unmasked and combated the evil, as the Christian.

2. This prophecy warns us against indifference to the earliest, weak beginnings of evil, and to the motions of unbelief. We are to regard these as approximations to that time of extreme degeneracy. We are to watch and be on our guard against them, even against the least assent to principles that disparage Christianity.

3. So much the more is it our duty to hold firmly and immovably by true Christianity, which can alone preserve us from that aberration. The man, in whom is the Spirit of Christ, cannot be harmed by the spirit of Antichrist. We should also be concerned for our descendants, to maintain the true faith among them.

4. This prophecy, moreover, may console us, as we look on the signs, the preludes, or finally the actual irruption, of the Antichristan period. God long ago foresaw it, announced it, permitted it; it cannot, therefore, destroy His work, but must rather serve for the more certain and speedy consummation of the kingdom of Christ. Christ will protect His own, will comfort them under violence, secure them against falsehood, and finally achieve their complete redemption.

* [*Untergebracht* (*besiegt*)—the former word being scarcely now used in this sense.—J. L.]

2. Ch. II. 13–17.

Exhortation, growing out of the foregoing instruction: Christians, whom God has saved from the Antichristian ruin are the more encouraged to stand fast, and for them the Divine guardianship is besought.

13 But we are bound to give thanks always to God [Greek order: to God
always] for you, brethren beloved of the Lord,[1] because God hath from the
beginning chosen you [God chose you from the beginning][2] to salvation through
14 [in][3] sanctification of the Spirit and belief [faith][4] of the truth; Whereunto He
called you[5] by our gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus
15 Christ. Therefore [So then],[6] brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions
[instructions][7] which ye have been taught [were taught, ἐδιδάχθητε], whether by
16 word, or our epistle [by our word or epistle].[8] Now our Lord Jesus Christ
Himself, and God, even our Father [But may He Himself, our Lord Jesus Christ
and our God and Father],[9] which hath loved us, and hath given [who loved us,
and gave, ὁ ἀγαπήσας ἡμᾶς, καὶ δούς] *us* everlasting consolation and good hope
17 through [in, ἐν] grace, Comfort your hearts, and stablish you [establish *you*][10] in
every good word and work [work and word].[11]

[1] V. 13.—[Sin.[1] A.: ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου.—J. L.]

[2] V. 13.—[εἵλατο—so nearly all the critical editors (on large uncial authority, including Sin.), instead of the *Rec.* εἵλετο—ὑμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.—J. L.] We retain the *Rec.* ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, which, besides A. D. E. K. L. and most of the Fathers, is given also by the Sin. The reading ἀπαρχήν, B. F. G., Vulg. *primitias* [Lachmann], is an (unnecessary) attempt at alleviation; see the exposition.—[Sin.[1] D.[1]: εἱλ. ἡμᾶς.—J. L.]

[3] V. 13.—[ἐν; comp. 1 Thess. iv. 7, and see the exposition.—J. L.]

[4] V. 13.—[πίστει with the genitive of the object. *Revision:* "See E. V., Mark xi. 22; Acts iii. 16. Nowhere else, out of two or three hundred instances, does E. V. render πίστις, *belief.*"—J. L.]

[5] V. 14.—The connection requires ὑμᾶς, which, besides many other authorities, is retained also by Sin.; itacism led in A. B. D.[1] to the reading ἡμᾶς [Lachmann.—Sin. F. G.: εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐκ.—J. L.]

[6] V. 15.—[ἄρα οὖν. See 1 Thess. v. 6. Critical Note 9.—J. L.]

[7] V. 15.—[παραδόσεις; Riggenbach: *Ueberlieferungen.* *Revision:* "Campbell: 'The word *tradition* with us imports, as the English lexicographer rightly explains it, "anything delivered orally from age to age;" whereas παράδοσις properly implies, "anything handed down from former ages, in whatever way it has been transmitted, whether by oral or by written testimony; or even any instruction conveyed to others, either by word or by writing." In this last acceptation we find it used in . . . 2 Thess. ii. 15.'"—J. L.]

[8] V. 15.—[διὰ λόγου εἴτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ἡμῶν = *by word or by epistle of us.* Ellicott (Am. Bible Union): *by word, or by our epistle* (*letter*). But the ἡμῶν belongs to both nouns.—J. L.]

[9] V. 16.—[αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν. The grammatical construction is the same as in 1 Thess. iii. 11, where see Critical Note 8, and Exegetical Notes 9, 10.—J. L.] The reading καὶ θεός without ὁ seems to connect θεός as another predicate for Christ with the previous κύριος; but the most important authorities that omit the article before θεός (B. D.[1]) read for it afterwards ὁ πατήρ instead of καὶ πατήρ, so that even this reading gives no different sense from the *Recepta.* [Lachmann reads thus: ὁ χριστὸς καὶ (ὁ) θεὸς ὁ πατήρ; Sin.[1] thus: Ἰησ. Χρ. καὶ ὁ θεὸς ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν; and a correction cancels the letter ὁ.—J. L.]

[10] V. 17.—The majority of the oldest codd. [including Sin.] versions and Fathers [and modern critics] omit ὑμᾶς after στηρίξαι, so that to this verb τὰς καρδίας also belongs as object [to which Alford properly objects that these are not the agents in ἔργον and λόγος.—For ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας, Sin., as A., reads τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν.—J. L.]

[11] V. 17.—The preponderance of authorities (also Sin.) is in favor of the order, ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ [and so nearly all the critical editors], instead of the reverse order of the *Recepta.*

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. (Vv. 13, 14.) **But we are bound,** &c.—Paul concludes the section on the coming of Antichrist with thanksgiving for the election and salvation of the readers; with an exhortation to steadfastness; and finally with a prayer for their stability. After the serious and agitating topic, of which he had been speaking, he is the more inclined to utter a word of thanksgiving, exhortation, and comfort. Already Theophylact remarks: He now softens his address, after the words of terror. For even though the prospect of the final conflicts was of itself a matter of consolation for true believers, yet the grave question still presented itself: How shall we endure? *We are bound to give thanks,* he says, and so reverts to ch. i. 3. There he gave thanks for their steadfast faith amid persecutions from *without.* Now his thanksgiving is still further enlarged, the ground being salvation likewise in view of the afflictions of the last time; and he gives thanks, notwithstanding that he had to make mention of the apostasy *within* Christendom (v. 3). **We,** he writes, namely Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy [Jowett, Conybeare, Webster and Wilkinson: Paul alone]; most say: in opposition to the perishing, v. 10, who fall away to Antichrist. But this antithesis does not come out right; a suitable contrast to the perishing would be the Thessalonians, not the preachers of the gospel. Theophylact perceives this, and therefore remarks: "If *we* give thanks for you, how much more are *ye* bound to do so!" It is better, therefore, to understand the matter with Hofmann, thus: Over against the Antichristian deception which God will send (and which, as an active mystery of iniquity, has already begun), we, the preachers of the gospel, give thanks for what He is now working by us, to save you from the coming judgment, and we the more give thanks, when we see how the way of this judgment is already preparing.—**Brethren beloved of the Lord,** this is his anchor-ground; here is his comforting assurance: *Those grievous sinners cannot*

hurt you. In 1 Thess. i. 4 the word is ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, which is given here only by D.[1] Vulg.; Sin. and A., τοῦ κυρίου; most, κυρίου without the article; which is here distinguished from Θεός before and after, and yet one with the Father: Christ; in opposition to Antichrist, to whom the others fall away. In the former place Paul gave thanks for their ἐκλογή, here in the same sense: ὅτι εἵλατο ὑμᾶς (this Alexandrian form, instead of the *Rec.* εἵλετο is given by nearly all the uncials). **For you,** which is now more fully explained: to wit, **that* God chose you.** Elsewhere Paul says ἐκλέγεσθαι, *to select for one's self;* only here, αἱρεῖσθαι, *to choose,* that is, for something, here εἰς σωτηρίαν; in the Septuagint the word is not of rare occurrence; for example, Deut. xxvi. 18, of the choosing of the people of God. Instead of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, Hofmann also prefers the reading ἀπαρχήν, which cannot be understood as in Rom. xvi. 5 and 1 Cor. xvi. 15. Lünemann observes that the Thessalonians could not be so called, since they were neither generally, nor even in Macedonia merely, the first that believed. This reading is one of the considerations by which Grotius would support his strange hypothesis, that the Epistle was addressed to Christians from Judea. Hofmann, according the reference to earlier or later conversion, finds here simply the idea of firstfruits consecrated to God, in opposition to the mass of the profane, and compares Rev. xiv. 4. But the reading is too feebly supported. We therefore adhere to ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, **from the beginning.** Is this, however, to be taken relatively, or absolutely? Such as prefer the former idea understand it as Zwingli: *ab initio prædicationis,* amongst you, or in Macedonia generally. Nor can it be positively required that in this case there should have been an addition like that in Phil. iv. 15 (τοῦ εὐαγγελίου); for even without any addition the expression has this signification at 1 John ii. 7, 24. But certainly the connection there favors this view, as it does not here; for even to say, that the phrase is to be explained in opposition to the last things, does not suggest this limitation: *in the beginning of the gospel.* Moreover, the expression so understood would imply that the time, when Paul wrote, was already considerably remote from the time when the church was founded. Calvin remarks still further, that he meant to furnish a ground of consolation, which should be available, not merely for those converted at the commencement of preaching, but for all the elect. But the decisive consideration is this, that that restriction does not suit εἵλατο. God's election is eternal, and only the accomplishment of it by means of the call takes place in time. It is therefore equivalent to *from eternity,* as we men can form a conception of that; so far as we can go back in thought; or to πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (Eph. i. 4; comp. 2 Tim. i. 9). 'Απ' ἀρχῆς is similarly used in 1 John i. 1; ii. 13; Is. xliii. 13 Sept.; and thus it is understood by Calvin, Bengel, and the moderns generally. He hath chosen us **to salvation,** in opposition to those who received not the truth that they might be saved (v. 10). In the subsequent ἐν ἁγ. alongside of εἰς De Wette would find an indication of the nearest object (1 Thess. iv. 7): *to* sanctification; but in this way the change of the preposition would be ill accounted for. The ἐν, &c. cannot belong to εἵλατο, since the objective purpose of free grace is not conditioned by the subjective process in us. Even Lünemann's view, that it belongs to the whole of εἵλατο εἰς σωτηρίαν, and denotes the means through which the past election to eternal salvation should be realized, is liable to the same objection: It is not the election, but the being saved, that is accomplished in sanctification; Hofmann: The choosing does not need this means. *In* is instrumental—equivalent to *by means of,* as already Chrysostom explains ἐν by διά, and has a close connection with εἰς σωτηρίαν, as Theophylact intimates: ἔσωσεν ὑμᾶς, ἁγιάσας διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος.* Sanctification is now inwardly the aim of the Divine counsel towards us (1 Thess. iv. 3), in opposition to the having pleasure in unrighteousness (v. 12); it is the way likewise to the future outward δόξα (v. 14). But how are the two following genitives to be understood? ἀληθείας must be a genitive of the object, as in Phil. i. 27; but πνεύματος is not essentially so co-ordinate as that the parallelism could force us to understand that genitive in the same way. Were πνεύματος also a genitive of the object, it would denote man's own spirit, which is to be sanctified through the operation of the Holy Ghost, and then rule the whole man. It would be strange, however, and contrary to 1 Thess. v. 23, that the spirit alone should be designated as the object of sanctification. And since even so the parallelism would not be at all a conclusive one, it is better to give it up entirely, and regard πν. (with Theophylact, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, and most of the moderns) as a genitive of the author: in sanctification proceeding from the (Holy) Spirit (1 Pet. i. 2); **and faith of the** (Divine) **truth,** the latter clause being opposed to belief of the lie (v. 11). It is unsuitable to explain ἀληθείας as an adjective: *in true faith* (Chrysostom, Pelt). Olshausen makes a great difficulty of the fact, that the first thing in order (faith) here follows after, and therefore thinks we must here understand that faith perfected in judgment, which already presupposes sanctification; similarly Chrysostom, Theophylact: Even *after* sanctification we require much faith, that we may not fall away from it. But it is simpler to understand with Lünemann, that the objective, the working of the Holy Spirit (whose final aim in this world is sanctification), is followed by the subjective, the receptivity of faith for the Holy Spirit's operation: faith following on ἁγιασμός, as the first thing that the Holy Spirit works, and as the way to the achievement of sanctification. [Webster and Wilkinson: No precedence of time, or sequence of cause and effect is to be inferred from the order of the clauses; cf. 1 Cor. vi. 11. Holiness which is ascribed and is due to the immediate action of the Holy Spirit, is also produced instrumentally by belief. And belief is the result of the Holy Spirit's influence upon the heart, an influence which changes and sanctifies.—J. L.] *The truth* is to be understood here in its highest perfection, as in John xiv. 6; xviii. 37; whoever is faithful in the first principles of truth, is then open to the voice of truth in its perfection.

* [So Riggenbach, with many others (as Luther, Lünemann, De Wette, Ellicott, &c.), prefers to render the ἐν.—J. L.]

* [Ellicott: "The prep. ἐν may be instrumental (Chrysost., Lünem., al.), but is perhaps more naturally taken in its usual sense as denoting the spiritual state in which the εἵλατο εἰς σωτηρίαν was realised." Webster and Wilkinson: "ἐν ἁγ. following εἵλ. indicates that their present state, character, and qualification for future blessedness, are the effect of God's choice, involved in it, as part of His original purpose of grace towards them. So in 2 Pet. i. 1, 2. And see Rom. viii. 29; Eph. i. 4, 5, 6."—J. L.]

The contrast to this is, that ἀδικία, on the other hand, rushes into bondage under falsehood (v. 11).—**Whereunto He called you**; it is not said εἰς ἣν (πίστιν, or some such word), but εἰς ὅ, so as to embrace all that precedes; *whereunto*, namely, to this σωθῆναι ἐν ἁγ. καὶ πίστ. (LÜNEMANN). The καλεῖν is the carrying out of the εἵλατο; 1 Thess. ii. 12; iv. 17.—**By our gospel**, our preaching of the glad tidings (1 Thess. i. 5); the gospel which we proclaim (to that extent only, ours; Rom. ii. 16). [BURKITT: "It is also a word of esteem, love, and affection; what we love, we call ours."—J. L.] This is the historic condition; how can they believe, if there be no preaching? (Rom. x. 14.) Now follows a second εἰς, an explanatory apposition to εἰς ὅ,* or the final object of faith and sanctification—a distinction of no importance, and depending merely on whether we understand the σώζεσθαι, contained substantially in εἰς ὅ, in a narrower or a comprehensive sense. At all events the Apostle is now speaking of the final consummation of the σωτηρία: **to the obtaining**, acquisition, taking possession, **of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ**; to a participation therein, to be glorified with Him. So we are to understand περιποίησις (comp. 1 Thess. v. 9), with GROTIUS, OLSHAUSEN, DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN, EWALD, HOFMANN. Incorrectly LUTHER [CALVIN, and others. See the *Revision* on this verse, Note e.—J. L.]: *for a glorious possession of Christ*, namely, that we should become so; but it is not well to sink δόξης to a merely adjectival idea, and in the explanation of περιπ. to vary from 1 Thess. v. 9. Paul does not mean merely: *Thy purchased heritage*, but: *Thy purchased heir am I*. Still more unsuitable is the explanation of CHRYSOSTOM, THEOPHYLACT [VATABLUS, CORN. A LAPIDE], and others: *to acquire glory for Christ*, the glory of Christ, the Friend of man, consisting in the salvation of many. The thought would be a beautiful one, but in that case we must have had τῷ κυρίῳ. What Paul says is rather in substance the same as in Rom. v. 2; viii. 17, 29; Phil. iii. 21; John xvii. 22 sqq. (participation in the life of Christ's glorification). Such is the description of the final consummation of the redemptive work: the receiving of spiritual life, powerful, and exempt from death. That will be the crowning of the last stage—of sanctification, namely—that is aimed at in the unglorified, earthly life. The destiny thus promised to the Thessalonians is confirmed by the exhortation that follows.

2. (V. 15.) **So then, brethren, stand [fast]**; since such an end awaits you, and God overlooks nothing that concerns you, do you your part. Encouragement (by a thankful recognition of the good that exists) and exhortation stand always together in reciprocal relation. [WEBSTER and WILKINSON: The most assured hope of salvation does not render exertion and admonition unnecessary; on the contrary, the exhortation to steadfastness and watchfulness here follows as an inference from the assertion of certain safety.—J. L.] *Stand fast* (1 Thess. iii. 8) in the conflict; opposed to the σαλευθῆναι of v. 2; **and hold** (the same word in Mark xvii. 3, of the Pharisees), *nil addentes, nil detrahentes*, BENGEL; in order to personal steadfastness it is required to hold fast **the traditions [instructions]**; LUTHER: *Satzungen* [*statutes*]; ZWINGLI: *institutiones;* CALVIN rightly: not merely external discipline, but whatever was offered to you in doctrine and precept for knowledge and practice. We are not to think so much of transmission from fathers to children, as of the delivery of that which the Apostle had received for them from God; comp. παρέδωκα of Christ's death on the cross, 1 Cor. xv. 3; of the Lord's Supper, 1 Cor. xi. 23; τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε (as here κρατεῖτε), 1 Cor. xi. 2.—**Which ye were taught** (comp. WINER, § 32. 5); **whether by word** (at first, oral preaching) **or by epistle** (the subsequent confirmation) **of us**; ἡμῶν belongs to both substantives, *word and epistle* denoting merely two different forms for the same substance, and εἴτε—εἴτε showing the closeness of the connection (1 Cor. xiii. 8); ZWINGLI: *quæcunque docui sive præsens, sive absens.* By δι' ἐπιστ. without the article is denoted not any single particular epistle, but the one method of instruction over against the other; not merely therefore the First Epistle, though, of course, the expression suits that in the first instance, but they should also hold what they were taught in this Second Epistle, and, should he follow it with a third, they were to lay that likewise to heart, and generally to give heed also to the epistolary instruction (comp. 1 Thess. v. 27), holding fast whatever in word or writing really comes from him, and is not merely ascribed to him falsely, as that letter of v. 2.

3. (Vv. 16, 17.) **But may He Himself, &c.**—The Apostle concludes the section with a benediction, as at 1 Thess. iii. 11; v. 23. *He Himself*, not merely we, who taught you; not merely you, whom we exhort: στήκετε.—**Our Lord Jesus Christ and our God and Father**; Father, that is, through Christ. Commonly the Apostle follows the reverse order; but here he goes back from Christ (who is for us also possessor of the glory that was last spoken of) to the Father, the ultimate ground of all blessedness, the ultimate Source of all exhortation, comfort, and confirmation. THEODORET (in the interest of the controversy with Arius) finds herein a proof, that the sequence of the names is no indication of a difference of dignity.*—**Who loved us** (all Christians) **and gave us everlasting consolation** (flowing from this love). The root of all is the unmerited love of God; the aorist denotes the historical proof of love, the work of redemption (comp. Eph. ii. 4; John iii. 16; 1 John iv. 10); the same thing is said of Christ, Gal. ii. 20 [Eph. v. 2, 25]. The *everlasting consolation* is by CHRYSOSTOM, THEOPHYLACT, and others, improperly taken as synonymous with hope; PELT interprets it of the everlasting blessedness (Luke vi. 24; xvi. 25: *to be comforted*). The latter is no doubt the highest end, but too far from being a present attainment, and still too tautological with what follows. Properly to distinguish it from that, we understand by *everlasting consolation* something real, now already present, which makes us of good courage now under the distress of the present time; not so personal, as in ZWINGLI's explanation: *quæ est ista consolatio? Christus Jesus;* but yet a benefit now already granted us in Christ, and showing itself to be an inexhaustible source of joy; namely, reconciliation with God as the foundation of all further hope.† With this

* [Better this, than to call it with ELLICOTT "a more exact specification of the preceding εἰς σωτηρίαν."—J. L.]

* [CHRYSOSTOM employs the same argument.—J. L.]

† [*Lectures*, p. 552: "*Who loved us.* This is sometimes restricted to God the Father" (LÜNEMANN, ELLICOTT), "and to His act of sending the Son to save us" (LÜNEMANN, RIGGENBACH). "I prefer to understand it of the eternal love—the love 'from the beginning' of both the Father and the Son. (To this the singular is no objection,

the hope of the consummation of glory is connected also in Rom. v. 1, 2; and the same truth in a somewhat different combination is expressed likewise in Rom. viii. 28 sqq.—**And good hope**; with which should be compared the *blessed hope* of Tit. ii. 13, *in heaven*, Col. i. 5, which non-Christians, the heathen especially, do not have, 1 Thess. iv. 13.—**In grace**, without merit of ours, is best referred to δοὺς, not so well (with DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN [CASTALIO, ESTIUS]) to both participles (it being less suited to ἀγαπ.). This is the foundation of his confident intercession: Such a God is ours, and in accordance with this His disposition I am able to desire for you, that He may **comfort your hearts**; for the two subjects the verb stands only in the singular (1 Thess. iii. 11); the two are one, even in the innermost and most glorious operations of grace. Herein shines the Divinity of Christ; it is not possible that the name of any man could be so often joined with the name of God. It is better here to understand the *calling to* [*zusprechen*, παρακαλέσαι] on the side of comforting encouragement, than on that of exhortation [as in 1 Thess. iii. 2; see there Exegetical Note 5.—J. L.]; the question is about their holding faith, and being free from fear and anxiety (v. 2), even in view of the aggravation of their afflictions; comp. Ps. cxix. 32.*—[ELLICOTT: "The Apostle does not say merely ὑμᾶς, but ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας (comp. Col. ii. 2); it was the καρδία, the seat of their feelings and affections, . . . the καρδία that was so full of hope and fear about the future, that the Apostle prayed might receive comfort."—J. L.]—**And establish**, &c.; if we do not read ὑμᾶς, it is simplest to regard the preceding καρδίας as still the object; it is less natural to supply in thought, with LÜNEMANN [and most others; see Critical Note 10.—J. L.], a ὑμᾶς out of ὑμῶν. *May He strengthen* [*establish*] *them*, that your sanctification may be perfected, and ye be not entangled in the apostasy of Christendom.—**In every good work and word**; not *by* work and word [CHRYSOSTOM, THEOPHYLACT, BENGEL], to wit, God's work and God's word; but with this παντί does not well agree, and ἀγαθῷ still less; since in that case no distinction would be necessary between good and bad. The adjective belongs to both substantives, not, as LUTHER translates, *in every doctrine and good work*. Nor is λόγος properly restricted to the idea of doctrine, as CALVIN too would have it: *sana doctrina*, and PELT, because, he says, it so stands at v. 15. But there the connection is different, the parallel member in this instance being ἔργῳ, which comprehends every action, and so does λόγῳ likewise (especially with παντί) every good word; ZWINGLI: *bonus sermo*. Doctrine is a part of that. The order, *word and work*, would be ascensive; in the more strongly supported reading *work* has the precedence as being the main thing; that must speak first of all. *May God strengthen you in every good work* wherein you are engaged (in opposition to unrighteousness), and then also *in every good word*, of truth, faith, love (in opposition to falsehood); when it comes from the bottom of the heart, and corresponds to the work, it is itself a work, yea, the criterion of perfectness (James iii. 2).

since this very anomaly is admitted in the next verse.) And then the latter half of the verse refers to the manifestation and effects of that love in time: *and gave us*, in the finished redemption of the cross, in the forgiveness of sin, in the presence of the Comforter, &c." The same distinction will be found applicable to nearly all the texts cited above.—J. L.]

* [LUTHER's somewhat free translation of the latter clause of that verse being: *Wenn du mein Herz tröstest*, *lest comfort*, &c."—J. L.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. (Vv. 13, 14.) On election, see at 1 Thess. i. 4 and ch. v. 23, 24. There is no question of a capricious preference of one, and disregard of another; such partial views are not taken by faith as faith; rather, in those who believe the consciousness prevails, that their salvation is not at all founded on their own merit. A faith even, which should be ever looking only at itself, would for that very reason be constantly threatened again with disturbance and agitation. Assurance is maintained only by going out from self, and casting one's self on the everlasting love and grace, whose purpose from the beginning, before the creation of the world, was the salvation of believers. Excellently RIEGER: In the description of the most formidable troubles eternal election is often introduced as the shelter of the saints, Matt. xxiv. 22, 31; Rev. xiii. 8; xvii. 8. But that which comes first is not the triumphal song of Rom. viii., but the way of righteousness (Rom. i.–vii.). Election provides a secret deposit; sanctification is election disclosed; and the root of that is faith in the truth.* But how does one become sure of his election? RIEGER: The purpose is seen in its accomplishment; the building shows the plan.—CALVIN: Because we are unable to penetrate into the secret counsel of God, that we may there become certain of our salvation, He gives us more accessible tokens and pledges of our election, to wit, in our sanctification by His Spirit, and our illumination in order to faith in His gospel.—BÖHL: *The Second Helvetic Confession* (Vienna, 1864), p. 19: It is in the way that we are to discover, whether we are on the way; we should not torment ourselves and others with the inquiry, whether even before the foundation of the world we were put on this way; we are rather to examine ourselves whether we have the way beneath our feet; and Christ is that way.—For the same reason we are not at liberty to place a false reliance on a *donum perseverantiæ*, as if we could be sure of any such thing out of Christ. The following admonition to steadfastness (comp. 2 Pet. i. 10) is seriously meant, and so is the benediction with which the section concludes.

2. (V. 15.) This verse is one of the words, by which of old (as early as CHRYSOSTOM) it was proposed to show the equal authority of oral tradition *alongside* of Scripture. But when JOHN DAMASCENE with this amongst others defends the worship of images, we have a striking instance of pretended tradition *in conflict with* Scripture. It is indeed clear, and no one contests it, that Christ did and spake many things that are not recorded, and in like manner that the preaching of the Apostles was first of all oral, which was then fixed and ascertained by writing; of course, in a short Epistle like ours, only very partially, still so as to guard against misapprehension and deterioration of doctrine. If then it is said that we are to believe also oral tradition, we answer: Yes, when its apostolic origin and character

* [In this is implied, what Scripture no doubt teaches, that election is the Divine root of faith. See v. 13; John vi. 37; Acts xiii. 48; Rom. viii. 28–30; Eph. ii. 8; 1 Pet. i. 2; &c.—J. L.]

are proved to us. But this very chapter shows us, how quickly the oral teaching was forgotten (v. 5), and was subjected to misconceptions or even falsifications (v. 2), so that it needed to be corrected and certified. The evangelist John also says (ch. xx. 30, 31), that Jesus truly did many things which are not written, but that the preceding selection was written for the confirmation of faith in the Son of God, and of life in that faith. For this, therefore, the written word is a sufficient source, and for whatever claims to be apostolic the only authentic rule. But can that be a genuine tradition, which contradicts the written gospel? Paul knows simply a double form for one and the same substance, nothing of additions that introduce a new and heterogeneous substance. In point of fact, there is beside the Bible *no* well-attested tradition. ZWINGLI: Paul, however, had taught nothing else but the gospel of Jesus Christ. CALVIN: When Paul will cast no snare on the Corinthians (1 Cor. vii. 35), how do they pretend to give out all their self-made ordinances as of equal dignity with the Pauline? HEUBNER: Paul does not say, that the tenor of the oral teaching was different from that of the written. [MACKNIGHT: No doctrines merit the name of *traditions* in the Scripture sense of the word, but such as were taught by the Apostles of Christ, or by other spiritual men, who received them by immediate revelation from Him.—J. L.]—It must be considered, on the other hand, how emphatically the Apostle here asserts the authority of his written word. It is no dead letter, but a seed-corn that is quickened in every susceptible heart. We know also that generally the written word is still more carefully weighed than that which is spoken. Many have an unintelligent aversion to all authority. They confound it with coercion and bondage. But authority is such an ascendency as rests on intellectual preëminence,* commends itself to rational conviction, and educates the obedient into true freedom. The mere fact that men are not self-created, implies that they cannot be absolutely autonomous; to say nothing of sinners, who need redemption. The true freedom is that with which the Son makes free (John viii. 36), and the means to this emancipation is holding fast His word in the obedience of faith. The highest freedom and joy is to live and move in the word of truth.

3. (Vv. 16, 17.) Evangelical comfort is something different from a transient and essentially vain feeding with illusions. Christ and His Apostles seem first to trouble the hearts of those whom they comfort, and show them that there may come a much severer experience than the frivolous mind imagines, but that all comes from God and for the promotion of His kingdom. To have God for ours, throughout even the hardest fortune, such is the everlasting consolation of the gospel. We must not at once think of the worst, that it will not turn out so bad; this is to comfort with unwholesome vanities, after the manner of the world. Such theoretical optimists readily become, when things go ill, practical pessimists, and in their despair disgracefully lay down their arms. It is better to be theoretically a pessimist, prepared for the worst, and practically through the grace of God an optimist, confident even in the worst.—[JOWETT: The Greek philosopher would have spoken of wisdom as an ἰάτρεια ψυχῆς, as we speak of the gospel as remedial to the ills of human nature. St. Paul uses stronger language; with him the gospel is a consolation. Within and without, the Christian is suffering in this evil world. The gospel makes him sensible of this state, and at the same time turns his sorrow into joy. . . . Rom. xv. 5; 2 Cor. i. 3.—J. L.]

* [In things pertaining to God, on a Divine commission.—J. L.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

V. 13: RIEGER: With every contemplation of what the enemy has done and will yet do, the servants of God nevertheless lose not their joy in God's husbandry [Matt. xiii. 25, 28; 1 Cor. iii. 9]; they are merely driven the more under the wings of God's grace.—HEUBNER: The election of a man to salvation is for others also a subject of thanksgiving.—DIEDRICH: Allow thyself to be sanctified in faith, and it is certain that thou art eternally chosen.—CHRYSOSTOM: Not by works, not by righteous conduct, but by faith of the truth do we attain to salvation.—STOCKMEYER: So we resist not this will of God, but yield ourselves to it, who shall be able to hinder its being carried through to a glorious issue?—*Berlenb. Bibel:* They who perish are ruined, not because they are absolutely rejected, but because they have no care for the truth. Believers are preserved, not because they deserve it, but because they cleave earnestly to God. Whoever concerns himself about the truth, so as to lay hold on God, is saved. But whoever meddles with God's word, and that not rightly, is only made worse by it.—[BURKITT: 1. Election is to the means as well as to the end. 2. Sanctification and holiness, not the cause of our election, but the effect and fruit of it. 3. Sanctification being the fruit, it is also the evidence of our election. 4. The necessary connection between the sanctification of the Spirit, and the belief of the truth.—J. L.]

V. 14. ZWINGLI: The gospel is God's alone; but ofttimes God communicates to us what is His. Paul could say that the gospel was his, as regards service and office.—DIEDRICH: Whatever Jesus has, that according to the will of the Father is also to be wholly ours.

V. 15. Over against the Antichristian deception, it concerns us to abide the more firmly by the word; only by the word can we overcome, as Christ overcame; Matt. iv.—[M. HENRY: He doth not say, Ye are chosen to salvation, and therefore ye may be careless and secure; but *therefore stand fast.* Comp. 1 John ii. 27, 28.—*Lectures:* An unwavering adherence to apostolic teaching is at once the great manifestation, and an essential condition, of Christian stability.—J. L.]

[WHITBY: How can she (the Church of Rome) be relied on as a sure preserver and true teacher of (unwritten) traditions, which hath confessedly (ANSELM, ESTIUS) lost one of great moment (vv. 5, 6), deposited with the Thessalonians, and the primitive Church?—J. L.]

Vv. 15-17. STOCKMEYER: There is no success without our own earnest willing and doing, nor without our own pains and labor; but the power which worketh in us both to will and to do is the Lord's. For this reason also, the Apostle is able to express what he had on his heart, in behalf of those who had become believing Christians, in a twofold manner, as an exhortation, v. 15, and again as a benediction and intercession, vv. 16, 17. The one does not exclude the other. The one is possible only through the other.

V. 16. There is mention of a good hope also in Prov. x. 28; xi. 23.*—[*Lectures: Good*, because of the preëminent excellence of the object of it, the impregnable basis on which it rests, and the purifying influence which it exerts in the heart and life.—J. L.]

Vv. 16, 17. Roos: Whoever has no experience of the love of God, and has obtained no consolation reaching into eternity, and no good hope through grace, on that man no doctrine and no exhortation to good works has any hold. When God comforts, He strengthens the soul, and when He strengthens, He comforts it.—[M. HENRY: 1. Comfort is a means of establishment; for the more pleasure we take in the word, and work, and ways of God, the more likely we shall be to persevere therein. And, 2. our establishment in the ways of God is a likely means in order to comfort; whereas if we are wavering in faith, and of a doubtful mind, or if we are halting and faltering in our duty, no wonder if we are strangers to the pleasures and joys of religion. What is it that lieth at the bottom of all our uneasiness, but our unsteadiness in religion?—J. L.]—HEUBNER: The consolation of Christianity is an everlasting consolation, true, certain, satisfying, a consolation of salvation; the consolation of the world is a spurious, pitiful consolation, which leads the deeper into perdition. God alone can put comfort into the heart, penetrating and abiding. Here is comfort: God loves thee, God chooses thee, God keeps thee.—*Berlenb. Bibel:* The everlasting consolation is a permanent, new-created life of the spirit, implanted amidst the anguish of suffering in truly following Jesus Christ, and so not liable to death or destruction.

V. 17. Word and walk must always go together.

Vv. 13-17. The good assurance of an evangelical preacher in behalf of his converts rests entirely, in its beginning, middle, and end, on God: 1. Eternal election, fulfilling itself in time in the call to faith and sanctification, makes the beginning; 2. the exhortation to steadfastness in apostolic truth forms the middle; 3. the end can be prosperous only by God carrying out in His everlasting faithfulness the work that He has begun.

* [LUTHER's version of the latter text: *Der Gerechten Wunsch muss doch wohl gerathen.*—J. L.]

III.

Closing Exhortations.

1. CH. III. 1-5.

The Apostle seeks their prayers, and commends to them generally a faithful perseverance in the true Christian spirit.

1 Finally, brethren, pray [Greek order: pray, brethren,] for us, that the word
of the Lord may have *free* course [may run][1] and be glorified, even as *it is* with
2 you [also with you];[2] And that we may be delivered from unreasonable [per-
3 verse][3] and wicked men: for all *men* have not faith [not all have faith].[4] But
the Lord is faithful [faithful is the Lord],[5] who shall stablish [establish] you,
4 and keep *you* from evil [*or:* the evil one].[6] And [But][7] we have confidence in
the Lord touching you, that ye both do[8] and will do the things which we com-
5 mand you.[9] And the Lord direct [But may the Lord direct][10] your hearts into
the love of God, and into the patient waiting for Christ [the patience of Christ].[11]

[1] V. 1.—[τρέχῃ. *Revision:* "E. V. *margin*, and everywhere else. Here it combines Tyndale, Geneva, Bishops' Bible: *have free passage*, with the Rhemish: *have course*."—J. L.]

[2] V. 1.—[καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Ellicott: "The καί gently contrasting (?) them with others where a similar reception had taken place." Rather, the καί compares them with—puts them alongside of—others, where, in answer to their prayers, a similar reception should yet take place.—J. L.]

[3] V. 2.—[ἀτόπων. The English margin, Hammond, Wordsworth: *absurd;* Benson, Scott, Conybeare, Alford's English Test., Ellicott, Am. Bible Union: *perverse;* Riggenbach: *verkehrten*. See the Exegetical Note.—J. L.]

[4] V. 2.—[οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις. Riggenbach, after De Wette and Lünemann: *nicht Aller* (Sache) *ist der Glaube;* Ellicott: *it is not all that have faith*. See the Exegetical Note, and the *Revision* of this verse, Note e.—J. L.]

[5] V. 3.—There is a preponderance of authority (including the Sin.) for ὁ κύριος; against the reading ὁ θεός [A. D.[1] F. G. Vulg. Lachmann.—J. L.] is likewise the fact, that according to parallel passages, such as 1 Cor. i. 9, it is the more obvious. [The Greek order should be retained in the translation, as it is by Riggenbach, Ellicott, Am. Bible Union, and others, making πιστός the instantaneous echo of πίστις.—Sin.[1]: ὁ κύριός ἐστιν; but corrected into ἐστ. ὁ κύρ.—J. L.]

[6] V. 3.—[τοῦ πονηροῦ. See the Exegetical Note.—J. L.]

[7] V. 4.—[δέ. *Revision:* "Not only do we rely on the faithfulness of the Lord, *but* we have a gracious confidence also in you; nor, indeed, can you expect the promised confirmation and security, apart from your own obedience, and patient continuance in well-doing, *but* only in and through that."—J. L.]

[8] V. 4.—The reading varies between ποιεῖτε and καὶ ποιεῖτε [Riggenbach's translation follows the former, which is that of Sin.[1], while Sin.[3] has the other.—J. L.]; the insertion of καὶ ἐποιήσατε before καὶ ποιεῖτε is too feebly supported (B. F. G., but not Sin.).

[9] V. 4.—ὑμῖν is wanting in Sin. B. D.[1] Vulg. [It is cancelled by Alford and Ellicott; Lachmann brackets it, as he does also the words καὶ ἐποιήσατε καί.—The latter half of the verse is arranged in Greek thus: *that the things which we command you ye both do and will do*.—J. L.]

[10] V. 5.—[ὁ δὲ κύριος κατευθύναι. Ellicott: "A gentle anithesis (δέ) to what precedes;—'I doubt you not, my confidence is in the Lord; may He, however, vouchsafe His blessed aid.'"—J. L.]

[11] V. 6.—Before ὑπομονήν all the uncials give the article τήν, which is omitted by the Elzevir after a few late authorities. The English Version translates ὑπομονή, *patience*, here in the margin, and always elsewhere, 31 times, except Rom. ii. 7 and 2 Cor. i. 6. Here it follows the Bishops' Bible.—J. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. (Vv. 1, 2.) **Finally, pray,** &c.—*Τὸ λοιπὸν* (here the article is wanting only in F. G.), equivalent to *λοιπόν*, 1 Thess. iv. 1 [ELLICOTT: "but, owing to the article, slightly more specific." Comp. 1 Thess. iv. 1, Exeg. Note 1.—J. L.]. GROTIUS: *Vox properantis ad finem.* It might be understood temporally: *henceforth;* but here it is better to take it in the sense of *furthermore, moreover, what I have still to say,* after the leading instruction on the subject of the last things. *Pray for us* (see 1 Thess. v. 25, and the note there), as we for you. These words also show the conclusion to be near. The subject of the prayer is again expressed in the form of purpose. It is a thoroughly disinterested prayer that he contemplates; not for his own personal concern, but for a main object of his apostolic calling (comp. Eph. vi. 19); not, that God would strengthen him in faith;—Paul did not, indeed, assume any such lofty position, as that he himself could not be a castaway (1 Cor. ix. 27); yet it would have been contrary to decorum, to ask his children for their prayers in that regard [?];—but, **that the word of the Lord may run;** the word of the Lord (1 Thess. i. 8), or the word of God (1 Thess. ii. 13), is the gospel. At 1 Thess. iv. 15 the phrase had a somewhat more specific meaning. *Tὸ run* is to fulfil its course swiftly and without hindrance; not bound (2 Tim. ii. 9); to spread itself to where it is not yet; and, where it is already, to bestir itself, and come into proper circulation. [Comp. the Sept. Ps. cxlvii. 15: *ἕως τάχους δραμεῖται ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ.*—J. L.]—**And be glorified,** not merely commended, and its glory recognized (Acts xiii. 48), but really glorified by its fruit, and actual demonstration of its Divine power and truth; CALVIN: in the renewal of men into the image of Christ; whereby, certainly, are called forth many praises to God (comp. ch. i. 12; Rom. xi. 13).—**Even as it is also with you** (1 Thess. iii. 4); he thus cheers them (comp. 1 Thess. ii. 13). Your prayers are to help the missionary work. The two present tenses after *ἵνα* denoted something continuous; whereas the aorist subjunctive with the second *ἵνα*: **and that we may be delivered,** marks a single occasion, deliverance from an actually existing peril. Here now in the second instance is a question of personal preservation, but here also again with a view to his office, that he may be kept safe for that. *We* may mean *I Paul,* or else *I and Silvanus and Timothy;* but certainly not, *I and you Thessalonians,* since he reverts to them again at v. 3. THEODORET remarks that the prayer seems to be twofold, and yet is but one; for when the ungodly are subdued, the word of the message also has unobstructed course. THEOPHYLACT: He prays thus, not that he may run no danger, for to that he was even appointed. But we cannot understand the deliverance as does CALVIN: *sive per mortem, sive per vitam;* for his desire here is to be preserved to his earthly office. The *ἄτοποι* are properly such as are not in their place; the neuter denotes at Luke xxiii. 41 a criminal act; the masculine is here rendered by the Vulgate, *importunis;* Cicero explains it once by *ineptus;* but here it signifies not merely people who act improperly, but such as hinder and resist Divine and human order; WETSTEIN: *facinorosus, flagitiosus.* Still there is rather couched in the expression a certain reserve, though it does denote perverse, base men; *Berlenb. Bibel* [BENGEL]: *ungereimte* [*absurd*]; and then *πονηρὸς* has a more forcible import: *bad, wicked.* Paul has in his mind deliverance from snares, as at Rom. xv. 31; for it would be a mistake to think of the contradiction of heretics (CHRYSOSTOM, THEOPHYLACT: such as Hymenæus and Alexander; ZWINGLI thinks that Paul intends hypocrites and false brethren; CALVIN: at least faithless Christians in name, *along with* furious Jewish zealots). The early date of the Epistle does not accord with the idea of false teachers, but very well with that of fanatical Jews, who expressly laid wait for the Apostle at Corinth (DE WETTE and the moderns generally); Acts xviii. 9, 10 answering perfectly to our v. 1, and Acts xviii. 12 sqq. (the accusation before Gallio) to our v. 2. This again is a fine stroke of unstudied, artless coincidence with the apostolic history; a proof of genuineness.—**For not all have faith.** He thus gives the reason why he is compelled to speak of such men, from whose hands the point is to be delivered, and for whom one cannot simply pray: Convert them! (comp. John xvii. 9 with v. 20). Some allege that Paul cannot be bringing forward the common-place: *All do not believe,* and thence infer that we must understand his meaning to be: It is not all who pass for Christians, that have *true* faith (so CALVIN [JOWETT] and others); they therefore think that the adversaries are (CALVIN: at least in part) false Christians. But there is thus introduced what is not found in the expression, *ἡ πίστις* meaning Christian faith absolutely, not true faith in opposition to that which is merely pretended. However, the sentence is no bare commonplace; nor yet is it suitable, as the phrase is abused for a frivolous excuse; and as little is it an assertion of the absolute Divine decree, as if God were unwilling to give faith to all; but a grievous charge: There are even people too *ἄτοποι καὶ πονηροί,* treacherous and impure, to be susceptible of faith.* It is a fine remark of BENGEL, how appropriately Paul writes thus to those very Thessalonians who had been so prompt to believe: Be not surprised, if this is not the case with all.

2. (V. 3.) **But faithful is the Lord.**—Not in German, but in Greek [and English] there is observable an antithesis between *πιστὸς* and *πίστις* of v. 2 (comp. 2 Tim. ii. 13). But this is no reason for translating that *πίστις* by *faithfulness; ἡ πίστις* denotes Christian faith; but this is essentially faithfulness to God, trust in His faithfulness, whereas unbelief is faithlessness, distrust of His grace. There is peril in having to live amongst such unbelieving and therefore also faithless men. To this grief, therefore, he at once opposes the consolation—to man's unfaithfulness the invariable faithfulness of God. The faithful Lord suffers not the *ἀτόπους καὶ πονηροὺς* to get the upper hand. *The Lord* (according to the best reading) is Christ. That it can here, as in the Septuagint, mean only God (namely, the Father), is asserted by HILGENFELD in the interest of the spuriousness of the Epistle, but without any valid reason (comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 7 along with Rom. i.

* [*für den Glauben empfänglich*—the expression employed also by DE WETTE and LÜNEMANN. It is not, however, of a want of susceptibility of faith in the most desperate class of sinners, that Paul speaks, but of the actual destitution of faith in some to whom the gospel came. And the fact is "stated in general terms; not so much as something that had just transpired in the particular city or region where the Apostle was now laboring, but rather as something that holds good, as with the force and regularity of a law, wherever the gospel is preached" (*Lectures,* p. 560). Comp. Matt. xix. 11.—J. L.]

10). It is to be observed that Paul does not dwell on his own distresses, but the reflection, that the Thessalonians in their locality have the same experience of human wickedness as himself in Corinth, leads him at once back again to his own afflicted spiritual children, who are, indeed, as yet less experienced than he.—**Who shall establish you** (not simply *may*, ch. ii. 17), so that such as have not faith shall not be able to drag you off with them; **and keep you from the evil.** How this last word is to be taken is doubtful, as in Matt. vi. 13; John xvii. 15, and elsewhere. It may be that it is to be understood as neuter, as at Rom. xii. 9: *from the evil with which perhaps bad men threaten you;* the Lord will keep you, so that whatever is done to you outwardly shall do you no inward hurt, and that which is properly πονηρόν shall not come to you, nor shall you be worsted in the conflict; and He will also so far avert outward harm, that the trial become not too severe (1 Cor. x. 13).* Possibly, however, it is to be regarded as masculine; ὁ πονηρός, the Prince of evil, whose instruments evil men are, dares not touch you (comp. Eph. vi. 16; 1 John ii. 13; v. 18). It is at any rate improper to take the singular: *the evil* (man) as collective for evil men [the Dutch Annotations, KOPPE, ROSENMÜLLER, FLATT, allow this interpretation.—J. L.]. But LÜNEMANN's assertion that it *must* be understood as neutral, on account of the opposition to ch. ii. 17 [a point which ALFORD also makes.—J. L.], is groundless; especially after the separation made by τὸ λοιπόν (v. 1), of which, indeed, LÜNEMANN generally makes too little account (see the close of the Introduction). In favor of the masculine are CALVIN, BENGEL, RIEGER, VON GERLACH, OLSHAUSEN [and very many others, from ŒCUMENIUS and THEOPHYLACT to ELLICOTT and WORDSWORTH.—J. L.], also HOFMANN: *From the evil man he comes to the Evil One, who might rob him of the fruit of his labor;* we add, *by persuasion or else by seduction*, and refer to 1 Thess. ii. 18; iii. 5. Whether it be neuter or masculine, Paul's promise is: God will establish you *for* the conflict, and protect you *in* it.

3. (Vv. 4, 5.) **But we have confidence in the Lord touching you.**—After reliance on God, there now follows again (as in ch. ii. 15) an exhortation, expressed in the delicate and winning form of confidence. THEODORET: For he is not forcing them, but seeking their free conviction: keep yourselves worthy of this good opinion. You can surely do so, since the Lord strengthens and guards you. This at once leads to, and prepares for, the special exhortation of v. 6 sqq. *In the Lord*, the same expression as in Gal. v. 10; comp. Phil. ii. 24; Rom. xiv. 14. In Him our confidence in you has its strong foundation; we boast not of the flesh, and place not our hope in you as men, but only in the Lord; and yet in the Lord *touching you;** because ye stand in Him as we do; ye will thus receive the exhortation in the name of the Lord, and the Lord in whom ye stand will guide your hearts, and make you willing and able. The verb παραγγέλλειν is found also at 1 Thess. iv. 11, and the substantive παραγγελλία at 1 Thess. iv. 2; it is synonymous (at least on the practical side) with παράδοσις, ch. ii. 15. As faith originated only in an act of obedience, so likewise it is only in this way that it can be maintained. Obedience is thus connected with preservation. By understanding the verse in this way: *What we command and ye do, that ye will also do*, we should rend asunder what belongs together. Far more natural is this: **what we command you,** *ye both do and will do* (henceforward and with a constant improvement). This exhortation he immediately seals again by a precatory benediction: **But may the Lord direct,** &c. THEODORET: We need both, purpose and strength, from above.* The Lord alone can give you success. *The Lord* is, as always, Christ; not, as HILGENFELD again decides, God (the Father). BASIL the Great, THEODORET, THEOPHYLACT [WORDSWORTH], would have it, that Paul is speaking of the Holy Spirit, because it could not be said: *May Christ direct your hearts into the patience of Christ* (were this valid, it would hold still more strongly, inasmuch as it concerns the first member of the verse, that it could not be said: *May God direct your hearts into the love of God*). But the argument is not convincing. It were contrary to the whole usage of the New Testament, to understand by the Lord the Holy Spirit; 2 Cor. iii. 17 (to be explained by v. 6) is of quite another sort. Rather, Christ is repeated at the end of the second member, because it is remote from the subject, and separated from it by θεοῦ (comp., moreover, 1 Cor. i. 7, 8). Thus Christ, the Faithful (v. 3), who alone can make you do what is right, in whom alone we have confidence in you (v. 4), may He plainly direct (1 Thess. iii. 11, *our way;* here) **your hearts** (2 Chron. xii. 14, Septuagint), so that they reach out sincerely towards the mark. But the passage in Chronicles is not an irrefragable proof, that here also the mark of the κατευθύνειν must necessarily be a proceeding of the Thessalonians; the mark itself might be a Divine concernment, to which their hearts are to reach out in faith and trust. In the case of the first member, **the love of God,** it would no doubt be simplest to regard the genitive as a genitive of the object: *love to God* [DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN, ALFORD, *Lectures*, ELLICOTT, WEBSTER and WILKINSON, &c.], not the love which God gives or prescribes, though, of course, our love is awakened by a discernment of the love which God has to us. But in the second member a similar explanation does not present itself as quite so natural. CALVIN translates: *expectationem Christi*, and explains it still more distinctly to be the hope of the coming of Christ, under the constant endurance of the cross. Already CHRYSOSTOM proposes this view amongst others. And so HOFMANN: *It denotes the waiting of him who holds to Christ as his hope;* but what he alleges for this,—that, for example, in Jer. xiv. 8 Septuag. God is called the ὑπομονὴ Ἰσραήλ,—is a different expression from what we read here. Even the ἀναμένειν Ἰησοῦν (1 Thess. i. 10), or the ὑπομονὴ τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ κυρ. (v. 3 there), does not support the assumed sense of ὑπομονὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Proof is wanting, that the last phrase denotes a waiting for Christ. Rev. iii. 10 likewise is probably to be understood differently. Moreover, *patientia propter Christum præstita* (BENGEL) goes beyond the simplest geni-

* [Taken as neuter, τοῦ πονηροῦ might perhaps have "a special reference to the great current of evil which had already begun to flow, and which in the second chapter had been traced onward to its fatal issue." *Lectures.*—J. L.]

* [ἐφ' ὑμᾶς; *towards and upon you, in regard to you;* Germ. *auf euch.*—J. L.]

* [*Wir bedürfen beides, Vorsatz und Kraft, von oben*—sound doctrine, but scarcely an accurate rendering of: ἀμφοτέρων ἡμῖν χρεία, καὶ προθέσεως ἀγαθῆς καὶ τῆς ἄνωθεν συνεργείας.—J. L.]

tive. Nor can we well judge otherwise of the interpretation: "patient, steadfast adherence to Christ." DE WETTE appeals on behalf of his explanation: "steadfastness in the cause of Christ," to παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor. i. 5, and similar phrases in Col. i. 24; Heb. xi. 26), which, however, is by no means quite homogeneous with the expression before us. But if we explain, as PELT would have us do (and as CALVIN holds to be possible): *patience as coming from Christ or as wrought by Him*, or with GROTIUS: *cujus causa est Christus*, we then exchange the genitive of the object for the genitive of the author. Even the first member PELT would actually understand in a corresponding way: *love, which God infuses into our hearts;* but such a sense of ἀγάπη θεοῦ he cannot establish even by his appeal to δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ. Is it necessary, then, that both genitives be taken in the same way? LÜNEMANN rids himself of the parallelism, and understands the matter thus: *love to God* (object) *and the steadfastness of Christ* (genitive of possession); the latter in the sense that it also is ours, in so far as the Christian's endurance in affliction for the gospel's sake is essentially the same with the steadfastness that was peculiar to Christ Himself in His sufferings. To this would belong the idea which CHRYSOSTOM also admits as possible: *endurance as Christ endured.** For our own part, we did not consider ourselves bound by the parallelism at ch. ii. 13; but there πνεύματος and ἀληθείας were really more heterogeneous than the parallel genitives in our text. Inwardly, also, the latter are too strictly coördinate, for us to venture on quitting the parallelism. We should therefore prefer with OLSHAUSEN to understand both genitives as genitives of the subject. Nor indeed is it said: *May the Lord fill your hearts with love*, &c. (which could then be nothing but a dispositon of heart in the Thessalonians), but: *May He direct them*, according to our understanding, *into the love which God has to us*, and has especially manifested in the work of redemption, **and into the patience of Christ**, to wit, that with which He resigned Himself for us to suffering, and at all times supports us. May He direct your hearts to this centre, from which proceeds all the Christian's strength: the love of God, as most fully revealed in the patience of Christ. This will be to you not merely an example, but a source of strength for withstanding the evil (v. 3). The Thessalonians particularly needed this admonition to humility in order to check their eschatological impatience, which showed itself practically in their ἀτάκτως περιπατεῖν and περιεργάζεσθαι (vv. 6, 11). The address thus introduces in the most natural way the exhortation that follows.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. (V. 1.) That the word of God have free course and be glorified is not a thing that happens of itself, but is in part committed also to our fidelity. Every praying person, even though he himself has not the teaching faculty, is on his part a coworker therein. [SCOTT: The success of the gospel is as really promoted by fervent prayer, as by faithful preaching.—J. L.] We are not indeed to see life and movement in the Church only where extraordinary phenomena are making a stir. On the inconspicuous advance of quiet, faithful labor there rests a constant blessing. And yet the drowsy state of nominal Christendom must weigh upon our hearts, and raise the question whether we have been as assiduous as we ought in that spiritual work, which the Apostle requires from Christians.

2. (V. 2.) *Faith is not every man's affair*—this is a word which, like that other, *prove all things* (1 Thess. v. 21), is often enough subjected to frivolous abuse. Many an individual takes shelter in the subterfuge, that he is not at all organized for faith; for others faith may be the right thing, perhaps even honorable in them; but for him it is impossible to believe; nay, the Apostle himself says, &c. It is, however, of perverse and wicked men that he says, that faith is not for them (see the *Verantwortung des christlichen Glaubens*, 2d ed., p. 16 sq.). ROOS: What is here spoken of is not that natural unaptness for faith, which exists in all men, but an unaptness which a man brings on himself by a prolonged departure from God, and by contracting a Satanic obduracy and wickedness.* STOCKMEYER: Faith is not a thing that a man has so completely in his own power, that he can say at any moment when he pleases: *Now I will believe;* there is required a certain preparation of soul, that is not found in every man. But it is a very perverse application of this, to say: "I too belong to the very class that has no concern with faith. What, then, can I do in that direction? And if faith is not every man's affair, is it so, that so much really depends on faith? is it so, that one can be saved only by faith? Surely God will not be so unjust!" But the Apostle does not say that a man can do nothing in this direction, so that he is innocent in the matter. Whence comes it that the disposition of many men is unsusceptible of faith? Did God make them so? Is it God, who to some only will grant what is necessary to faith, while he refuses and withholds it from others, however earnestly desirous even they may be to obtain it? That be far from Him! † The Apostle teaches us to derive all want of susceptibility from a quite different source, even men's own fault (comp. ch. ii. 10–12). He will by no means apologize for unbelief, as if it were an unmerited fate from which some men cannot at all escape. He rather refers us to their own guiltiness, namely, their destitution of love for the truth, and that from the pleasure they have in unrighteousness.—At the commencement especially of a living Christian state we readily suppose, as the truth has become too strong for us, that others also should in like manner yield to it. Or, if that does not happen, we readily fall to blaming our elders and teachers for not having testified the truth with sufficient fervor. They, indeed, are required earnestly to examine themselves, whether they are not chargeable with some neglect or mismanagement. But the example of the Apostles, yes, of Christ Himself, shows us, that even the most faithful preaching is resisted by the natural heart of man.

* [So—besides LÜNEMANN—ALFORD, ELLICOTT, *Lectures*, &c.: "patience such as Christ exhibited."—J. L.]

* [See the foot-note to p. 156.—No doubt, there are degrees of wickedness in unrenewed men, as there are degrees of grace, faith, and holiness in Christian men. But in the case of *every* Christian man it is true, that his faith is "the gift of God" (Eph. ii. 8); and of *every* unrenewed man to whom the gospel comes it is no less true, that his unbelief is the sinful product of a sinful and blinded heart (John iii. 18–20; 2 Cor. iv. 3, 4; &c.—J. L.]

† [*Das sei ferne!*—the German version of μὴ γένοιτο, which in our English Testament is, *God forbid!* Comp. E. V. Gen. xviii. 25.—J. L.]

To this fact we must learn, with whatever loving sorrow, to reconcile ourselves, and least of all are we to try by means of false concessions to make the truth plausible to the enemies of the faith. Roos: A preacher of the gospel tries with all fidelity to set such people right. But, if he has a clear insight into the state of their souls, he finds personal relief even when seeing no fruit of his labor. He knows that God will not require their blood at his hand. Such is the consolation of Jesus Himself, Matt. xiii. 14, 15.

3. Roos: Deliverance from the wicked did take place, but not in such a way as the human sense might have desired; for Paul and other servants of God were often until their death harassed with such people; and yet God saved them from them by restraining their fury (frequently by means of the Roman authorities), by letting many blasphemers die at the right time, by humbling the whole Jewish people through the destruction of Jerusalem, and lastly by so ordering all things, that the Apostles, harassed and persecuted by the Jews in a daily trial of their faith, were only the more widely driven around in the earth.

4. (V. 4.) Roos: Paul wrote and did everything in the Lord and by the Lord (comp. vv. 6, 12; 1 Thess. iv. 1, 2; and elsewhere). These were not in Paul's case mere customary pious phrases; he had the feeling of them, and was convinced that in nothing did his commands, hopes, and instructions go beyond the power, and at the same time the light and inward impulse, given him by the Lord Jesus. He knew that he was not left to his natural reason and discretion, but that, being in Jesus, he saw by His light, worked in His strength, and by Him was held and controlled. Happy is he, of whom this is the experience. Whatsoever he doeth prospers [Ps. i. 3].—In the Lord we may also have confidence in others, who likewise stand in the Lord. To trust in men out of the Lord leads astray, and one must often learn, that all men are liars (Rom. iii. 4). The idealism of faith in humanity is then easily changed into that so-called knowledge of men, which looks for nothing but baseness in every one. Love, on the contrary, hopeth all things, and believeth all things (1 Cor. xiii. 7), without being blind to the corruption of nature; but it knows God who is greater than our heart [1 John iii. 20], and believes in His power to save and subdue. Relying on the Lord for everything, it believes also in the perfecting of His work in the hearts of His own, and throughout all interruptions still hopes for it. [BARNES: Not primarily in you, &c. He must be a stranger to the human heart, who puts much confidence in it even in its best state.—J. L.]

5. (V. 5.) Our heart must be directed to the love of God, as the foundation of all faith, and to the patience of Christ, as the chief manifestation of that love;—the latter, not merely in order to the contemplation of that greatest exemplar, but from this direction towards the character of God and Christ faith itself receives something of this Divine nature [2 Pet. i. 4], participates in these primary forces of life, so that it now does everything according to this rule, and from this impulse. Love enkindles love in it; the patience which Christ learned and practised, yea, with which He continually bears with us, brings this seed into the heart of the believer and from this vine there grows as a branch the patience of the Christian (RIEGER). Patience must not be wanting to love; otherwise the latter also would soon cease.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

V. 1. DIEDRICH: He had brought them by means of the word to faith; a stream of blessing should now also through their prayers and love flow back again to him, so that he may be able to deliver his testimony with ever-growing efficiency.—CHRYSOSTOM: Let no one from an excessive humility defraud us of this assistance.—STARKE: Since upright teachers carry the word of God amongst the people, it is reasonable that they be remembered in prayer; but, if they do not at once see fruit, they should labor on, and call to mind the Divine promises.—HEUBNER: The Christian Church should not be a motionless sea; stagnation brings corruption and death. The gospel must keep moving; it must run; this running produces everywhere, even where the gospel is not a stranger, new life and vivacity.—The missionary spirit knows no other goal than that described in Is. xi. 9.

V. 2. Faith is not every man's, though God offers faith to every man, Acts xvii. 31 (*Berlenb. Bibel*).*—GROTIUS: Such as take pleasure in vice will not believe us; because they love the works of darkness, they hate the light.—RIEGER: (We must have this told to us) partly that under a similar experience we may be less frightened, partly also that we may escape the frequently plausible temptation to refine and cut and carve at the doctrines of the faith, till every one should be able to find himself suited.—Paul strove to become all things to all men, but still he hoped for nothing more from it, than by all means to save some (1 Cor. ix. 22).—STARKE: Patiently to undergo suffering for Christ's sake, and yet to pray God for deliverance therefrom, are not inconsistent with each other; especially when the deliverance has for its object not so much our own ease as the glorification of the Divine name.

[*Lectures:* ἀτόπων καὶ πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων· οὐ γὰρ, κ.τ.λ. So far, then, from there being any ground for exalting reason against faith, it is only faith that can either restore the dislocation, or rectify the depravity, of our fallen nature.—THE SAME: No man can reject the Divine testimony concerning Christ, when fairly and fully presented to him, without thereby inflicting immediate and serious damage on his whole inward life—without, in fact, becoming, whatever appearances there may be to the contrary, a worse man, as well as a guiltier man, than he was before.—J. L.]

V. 3. The faithfulness of the Lord is the only ever sure refuge.

V. 4. CHRYSOSTOM, THEOPHYLACT: *We have confidence in the Lord*, that is opposed to pride; *touching you*, that is opposed to indolence.—BENGEL: *Nulli homini per se fidas.*—CALVIN: Authority and obedience have here their limits: Nothing except in the Lord!—[BURKITT: The character of that obedience which the gospel directs; it must be universal and perpetual.—J. L.]

V. 5. DIEDRICH: Truly Christ Himself is all patience with us, and so He teaches us in Him also to be all patience.

Vv. 1-5. HEUBNER: Exhortations to prayer and faithfulness.

Vv. 4, 5. That heart is well disposed, and capa-

* [LUTHER's version of πίστιν παρασχὼν πᾶσιν: *Jedermann vorhält den Glauben*; English margin: *offered faith.*—J. L.]

ble of all that is good, which through the grace of the Lord is directed into the love of God and into the patience of Christ. 1. The most natural thing for us would be, to abide with all love by the love of God, to which we owe ourselves and all things. But, as regards God, we are truly unnatural children; have little need of intercourse with Him, are frequently able to go a long time without Him, readily suffer ourselves to be withdrawn from Him by His gifts instead of being thereby led to Him, become altogether disheartened under the strokes of His discipline, do not love what He loves, His will, His commands. He gives effect to his love by sending His Son to save us from the fleshly temper of our heart. Not until our hearts allow themselves to be turned towards this love proceeding from God (1 John iv. 10; Rom. v. 8), does there rise in us also love to God. But, 2. that this spirit may take full possession of us, there is need of continual labor and effort; our hearts must allow themselves to be directed to Christ, the perfect pattern of patience, as He practised it throughout His whole life even to the cross towards His disciples, towards the people, towards His wicked foes. We must be thankful to Him, that He becomes not weary of bearing also with us. Thus we too learn patience, and receive strength for it out of His strength; thus do we learn to wait for His help, and patiently to hold fast the hope of His glorious coming (after STOCKMEYER.)

---

2. CH. III. 6–16.

He gives impressive directions as to the treatment of those, who will not desist from a pragmatical idleness.

6 Now [But][1] we command you, brethren, in the name of our[2] Lord Jesus
Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh [walking,
περιπατοῦντος] disorderly, and not after the tradition [according to the instruc-
7 tion][3] which he [they][4] received of [from, παρά] us. For yourselves know how
ye ought to follow [imitate][5] us; for we behaved not ourselves disorderly [were
8 not disorderly, οὐκ ἠτακτήσαμεν] among you; Neither did we eat any man's
bread [bread from any one, ἄρτον παρά τινος] for nought, but wrought with labor
and travail night and day [but in toil and travail, working night and day],[6] that
9 we might not be chargeable [burdensome][7] to any of you: Not because we
have not power [authority],[8] but to make ourselves an ensample unto you to fol-
low us [that we might give ourselves for a pattern unto you to imitate us].[9]
10 For even [For also],[10] when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if
any [any one] would [will, θέλει] not work, neither should he eat [let him eat,
11 ἐσθιέτω]. For we hear that there are some which walk [hear of some walking,
ἀκούομεν γάρ τινας περιπατοῦντας] among you disorderly, working not at all, but
12 are busybodies [being b., περιεργαζομένους]. Now them that are such [Now such,
τοῖς δὲ τοιούτοις] we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ [*or:* in the
L. J. C.],[11] that with quietness they work, and eat [working with quietness, they
13 eat, μετὰ ἡσυχίας ἐργαζόμενοι . . . ἐσθίωσιν] their own bread. But ye, brethren, be
14 not weary in[12] in well-doing. And if any man [But if any one, εἰ δέ τις] obey
not our word by this epistle [the ep.],[13] note that *man*, and[14] have no company
15 with him, that he may be ashamed [shamed].[15] Yet [And][16] count *him* not as
16 an enemy, but admonish *him* as a brother. Now the Lord of peace Himself
give [But may the Lord of peace Himself give, αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Κύριος . . . δῴη] you
peace always by all means [in every way].[17] The Lord *be* with you all.

[1] V. 6.—[δέ. *Revision:* "So far is it from being true, *however*, that the love of God and the patience of Christ are incompatible with the maintenance of a proper discipline, &c." Ordinarily, indeed, this δέ is regarded as merely *μεταβατικόν*. Webster and Wilkinson think it refers to ἃ παραγγ. in v. 4 = *Now the command I have to give you* is.—J. L.]

[2] V. 6.—Only B. D.[1] E.[1] omit ἡμῶν; the great majority of authorities have it; also Sin. [It is bracketed by Lachmann, and cancelled by Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott.—J. L.]

[3] V. 6.—[κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν. See ch. ii. 9, Critical Note 22, and ch. ii. 15, Critical Note 7.—J. L.]

[4] V. 6.—The third person plural, if not genuine, would least of all have come by correction, presenting as it does a slight inaccuracy of style;—παντός points to a plurality, and so the sequel treats of the ἀτάκτοις in the plural. The *Recepta* παρέλαβε has scarcely any support at all; παρελάβετε [Lachmann] is given, indeed, by B. F. G., but obviously as a correction; we have therefore to read either παρέλαβον (with Sin.[3] D. E. K. L., &c. [approved by Mill, and edited by Bengel, Knapp, Scholz, Schott.—J. L.]), or still better παρελάβοσαν (with Sin.[1] A. D.[1] [Griesbach, Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth, Ellicott, &c.—J. L.]), the rarer (Alexandrian) form; see Winer, § 13. 2; Rom. iii. 13; and the Septuagint often.

[5] V. 7.—[μιμεῖσθαι; comp. 1 Thess. i. 6.—J. L.]

[6] V. 8.—[ἀλλ' ἐν (Sin.: ἀλλὰ ἐν) κόπῳ καὶ μόχθῳ, νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν ἐργαζόμενοι. See foot-note to p. 162.—Lachmann reads νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, after Sin. B. F. G.—J. L.]

[7] V. 8.—[As in 1 Thess. ii. 9.—J. L.]

[8] V. 9.—[ἐξουσίαν. This word is rendered *authority* 29 times in our Common Version, and so here in nearly all the older, and in many modern, English Versions. Others have *right*.—J. L.]

[9] V. 9.—[ἵνα ἑαυτοὺς τύπον (see 1 Thess. i. 7, Critical Note 7) δῶμεν ὑμῖν εἰς τὸ μιμεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς.—J. L.]

[10] V. 10.—[καὶ γάρ. *Revision:* "And you cannot well doubt that such was our design *For* not only by our example did we inculcate this rule, but *also* by express precept." Ellicott makes this γάρ "coördinate with the preceding γάρ in v. 7" (so Lünemann), and finds here a "second confirmation of the wisdom and pertinence of the preceding warning that they ought to avoid those that were walking disorderly."—The τοῦτο before παρηγγέλλομεν is wanting in Sin.[1], but supplied by correction.—J. L.]

[11] V. 12.—The reading, ἐν κυρ. Ἰησ. Χρ. has the oldest authorities in its favor, A. B. Sin.[1] D.[1] E.[1] F. G., Versions [Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott, Riggenbach]; the other, διὰ τοῦ κυρ. ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. [Sin.[2] D.[3] E.[2] K. L.], is moreover the more usual with παρακαλεῖν.

[12] V. 13.—[For ἐκκακήσητε, Schott, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, Wordsworth, Ellicott, read ἐγ- (Sin.) or ἐνκακήσητε.—J. L.]

[13] V. 14.—[τῆς ἐπιστολῆς; *Revision:* "which I have just written, and which he will soon hear read." Ellicott, however: "This, perhaps, may remain as one of the *few* cases in which idiom and euphony may justify us in retaining the pronominal translation;" as does likewise Alford.—J. L.]

[14] V. 14.—The καί is wanting in A. B. Sin. D.[2] E. [Lachmann], and with this is connected the fact, that nearly the same authorities give the infinitive συναναμίγνυσθαι [Lachmann]; many codd., to be sure, are constantly confounding αι and ε, as the Sin. also just before gives σημειοῦσθαι; see the exposition. [Riggenbach brackets καί.—J. L.]

[15] V. 14.—[See 1 Cor. iv. 14; and so Ellicott here.—J. L.]

[16] V. 15.—[καί. See the exposition.—J. L.]

[17] V. 16.—[ἐν παντὶ τρόπῳ. Comp. ch. ii. 3.—J. L.] The only suitable reading τρόπῳ is sufficiently supported by A.[2] B. Sin. D.[3] E. K. L., Versions and Fathers; τόπῳ (A.[1] D.[1] F. G. [Vulgate]) arose probably from such places as 1 Cor. i. 2, and was improperly favored by Beza and Grotius. [Lachmann alone edits it.—J. L.]

The other various readings—v. 8, νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, instead of νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν; v. 11, a different position of the word περιπατοῦντας; v. 13, ἐνκακήσητε, instead of ἐκκ.—are of no consequence whatever to the sense.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. (V. 6.) **But we command you,** &c.—An adequate foundation having been laid, he comes now to speak of the matter specially in hand. The order is addressed to all the brethren, not, as OLSHAUSEN supposes, to the presbyters; THEODORET says merely, that the leaders of the Church must follow this rule. But the meaning of the Apostle is, in regard to all who are not themselves ἄτακτοι—all on whom he can rely, ὅτι ποιεῖτε καὶ ποιήσετε, &c. (v. 4)—now to tell them what they have to do.—**In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ** is this command given; as representing Him, standing in Him, we command, have confidence to do so; CHRYSOSTOM: It is not we that say it, but the Lord speaks by us; He who has the right to enjoin, and the strength for execution; equivalent to v. 12: *in the Lord*, or *by the Lord;* for the Lord Himself and His name are inseparable. Again, ὑμᾶς is not the object of στέλλεσθαι (this would not suit the middle voice), but the subject in the case of an accusative and infinitive; this occurs elsewhere only when the infinitive has a different accusative from the accusative or dative governed by the finite verb [comp. Acts i. 4 with 1 Cor. vii. 10]; but here ὑμᾶς stands, because παραγγ. ὑμῖν is already somewhat too far removed from the infinitive. The expression στέλλεσθαι HESYCHIUS explains by φοβεῖσθαι; THEODORET by χωρίζεσθαι. The idea starts from a sensuous point of view: *timidly to withdraw;* hence: *to be afraid;* 2 Cor. viii. 20, with τοῦτο; but in Mal. ii. 5 Sept. with ἀπό, in the sense: *to be in fear of.* Here this meaning is not suitable, since he is not exhorting them to fear, but directing a course of proceeding, the breaking off of intimate intercourse; Gal. ii. 12, ὑπέστελλεν ἑαυτόν (because in this case the middle is not used; the ὑπ- implies secrecy *); akin to Rom. xvi. 17, ἐκκλίνατε ἀπ' αὐτῶν.—**From every brother;** no such discipline is to be exercised towards those without (1 Cor. v. 11, 12), but only towards those who desire to be called brethren. According to Matt. xviii. 15 sqq. likewise a brother only is the object of Church discipline.—**Walking disorderly, and not according to the tradition [instruction]** (ch. ii. 15) **which they received from us,** namely, the brethren, even those ἄτακτοι; comp. 1 Thess. ii. 13; iv. 1. The receiving was through the medium of oral instruction, and this was confirmed by example (v. 7). On the ἀτάκτως περιπ. see already at 1 Thess. iv. 11; v. 14. Here as little as there does it denote a life altogether unregulated by Divine law, and utterly vicious; v. 11 shows that those are rather meant, who without any occupation bustled around in fanatical idleness. Before giving this more precise description of them, he prefixes a still more exact confirmation of his demands. Disorder, connected probably with eschatological excitement (ch. ii. 2), and with this EWALD would also join a mistaken appeal to a fraternal community of goods (1 Thess. iv. 9–12), must with some at least have been on the increase, in spite of the Apostle's exhortation. For this reason Paul, over against the tender, lenient words of the First Epistle, now applies a second and sharper course of discipline. The point is, to act vigorously against the unreformed, in order to arrest the contagion, preserve the church, and, if possible, exert by means of the stronger measures a saving influence on the obstinate offenders themselves.

2. (Vv. 7–9.) **For ye yourselves know how ye ought to imitate us** (1 Thess. i. 6); ye know it by word and deed on our part; he thus justifies the reproach which he makes against them in regard to the παραδόσεις, by setting forth what they themselves knew.—**For we were not disorderly** (without occupation) **among you;** he thus confirms the assertion: *ye know;* we might also connect this, as well as πῶς, &c., and as an explanation of that, with οἴδατε: *that we* (*that is to say*) *were not disorderly;* * so [Am. Bible Union] HOFMANN, who even (clumsily) makes v. 9 still governed by ὅτι.—**Neither did we eat bread from any one † for nought;** for nought, as a gift [ALFORD: there seems to be an allusion in the construction to the original sense of δωρεάν.—J. L.], without paying for it; he speaks humbly, as if labor in the gospel were no labor; that is the way, moreover, in which the worldly mind judges. It is a remark already of the Fathers, that it would not have been δωρεάν, had Paul even performed no manual labor. [See Matt. x. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 10.—J. L.] Bread is the plain and main article of food; *to eat bread,* a Hebraism, אכל לחם (Gen. xliii. 25; Luke xiv. 1), equivalent

* [So MATTHIAS and OLSHAUSEN explain ὑπέστελλεν, whereas ELLICOTT agrees with DE WETTE in regarding that rather as the initial act, which led to the second—the separation.—J. L.]

* [ELLICOTT: "*in that* we behaved not disorderly.—J. L.]

† παρά τινος. WEBSTER and WILKINSON quote the provincial English idiom: *off any man.*—J. L.]

to the simple ἐσθίειν (v. 10). Moreover, the German proverb also says: *Whose bread I eat*, &c.—**But working in toil and travail night and day [But in toil and travail, working night and day]**,* that is, we ate bread. De Wette would needlessly assume that the participle is used irregularly for the finite verb, or that ἦμεν is to be supplied, as at 2 Cor. vii. 5. Much more obvious in the present instance is the supplement ἐφάγομεν, so that ἐργαζόμ. form the antithesis to δωρεάν.—**That we might not be burdensome to any of you**; comp. 1 Thess. ii. 9 sqq.—(What I mean is) **not that**, or still better: (We did this) **not because we have not authority,** that is, to live of the gospel, or here, τοῦ δωρεὰν ἄρτον φαγεῖν, as in 1 Cor. ix. 6, τοῦ μὴ ἐργάζεσθαι; comp. the discussion in 1 Cor. ix. 4–14; Luke x. 7, *the laborer is worthy of his hire.*—**That we might give ourselves for a pattern unto you** (1 Thess. i. 7) **to imitate us**; such was his object, comp. Acts xx. 35. Hilgenfeld will have it, that to give the churches in this way an example was merely the result of the apostolic labor, but could not be the original design, as the forger here asserts. But really one cannot see why the Apostle, who represents to us details of his life as providential, as in 1 Cor. i. 14, 15, might not much more readily say with perfect truth, that he had wished to train his churches also by his own example.

3. (V. 10.) **For also when we were with you**; in confirmation of the example he says: For indeed we also (καὶ γάρ [see Critical Note 10]), when we were with you, commanded you that which our example showed you; command and example were harmonious. Lünemann [Alford] puts an improper emphasis on the τοῦτο, when he interprets thus: "For also *this* we commanded you"; with what other things? This distinction of several commands is here altogether an interpolation, and is besides contradicted by the verbal arrangement. Were we required by καί to seek for some other antithesis than the one indicated by us, it would be far more proper to understand the matter with Hofmann thus: For even when we were with you, already at that time, we commanded you; we do not now for the first time lay upon you a new yoke. At all events we perceive that already at his first visit Paul with keen pastoral insight saw the necessity of the warning. We commanded you, he speaks in the imperfect; this was our repeated order: **that, if any one will not work, neither let him eat**; if one would not work, as well as the Apostle who did double work, he did not at all deserve that food should be given him. If one will not, although he could; no reproach is cast on those unable to work; *nolle vitium est*, says Bengel. The word is a proverbial sentence, to which Grotius and Wetstein adduce many parallels from the Greeks and Rabbins. We are not at ἐσθίειν to think in the first instance of the Holy Supper.

4. (Vv. 11, 12). **For we hear**, &c.—Paul explains why the command (v. 10) was given.—**Of some** (not many, but even a few are a hurtful leaven, 1 Cor. v. 6) **walking among you disorderly**; this is now explained, and that in an earnest word-play, already imitated by Zwingli in the Swiss dialect: *Sy thund nüt und thund zuvil* [*They do nothing, and do too much.*—J. L.]; Calvin: *nihil operis agentes, sed curiose satagentes;* Ewald: *nicht arbeit treibend, sondern sich herumtreibend.** The περιεργάζεσθαι is, in fact, the phantom of a dutiful ἐργάζεσθαι; the giving up of one's self to idle roving, to aimless bustle, to by-matters and other people's concerns, with which we have properly nothing to do; instead of, as we ought, τὰ ἴδια πράσσειν (1 Thess. iv. 11). The adjective περίεργος is found 1 Tim. v. 13; comp. Acts xix. 19, τὰ περίεργα πράσσειν. Thus already in that time of freshest life there appeared this frivolous humor under the pretext of activity for the kingdom of God. A further stage of degeneracy is afterwards described in Phil. iii. 19; Rom. xvi. 18.—**Now such** (those who are of this sort) **we command**; addressing himself, though indirectly and in the third person, to those very persons; it was to be expected that all would be present at the reading of the letter (1 Thess. v. 25), and that no one would avoid listening to it. He at once softens his language, and speaks still in a more kindly tone, as he also requires at v. 15: **and exhort**; αὐτούς is now to be taken out of the dative τοιούτοις, by an obvious zeugma: **in the Lord Jesus Christ**; in Him our exhortation has its strength. If we read διά, then it is: *by means of Him*, while we avail ourselves of His name, and by His sacred person give impressiveness to our words: as you love the Lord Jesus, and fellowship with Him. The subject of the exhortation is expressed in the form of the object: **that working with quietness they eat their own bread**; ἡσυχία, comp. ἡσυχάζειν, 1 Thess. iv. 11, denotes rest, inward composure, retiredness, and avoidance of show, and stands opposed to περιεργάζεσθαι; *their own bread*, that is honestly earned, obtained by faithful and diligent labor with God's blessing, not begged bread, implies therefore ἐργάζ., and stands in opposition to the δωρεάν of v. 8.

5. (v. 13.) **But ye, brethren**; he thus turns, once more to those free from blame, and them only he accosts with cordial address.—**Be not weary,** dispirited (2 Cor. iv. 1, 16); in all the New Testament instances we find the variation ἐγκακεῖν (written also ἐνκακεῖν) given by the oldest authorities, instead of ἐκκακεῖν. The sense, as developed by Passow, is at the most according to the etymological genesis slightly different (*to be cowardly in anything*, or *to turn out cowardly*),† but in the end both come to the same thing; ἐκκακεῖν not being common elsewhere, the copyists probably introduced their familiar ἐγκ.—Become not disheartened **in well-doing.** Calvin, Estius, Pelt, De Wette, Ewald, Von Gerlach, and most others, refer the word to beneficence, and without question this thought would suit very well. That is to say, the Apostle, having in v.

* [Riggenbach's construction is the more common; but the other, "which makes ἐν κόπῳ καὶ μόχθῳ the positive complement, in opposition to δωρεάν, of ἄρτον ἐφάγομεν, and then adds νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν ἐργαζόμενοι as an explanatory parallel" (*Revision*), is adopted by the Dutch Version, De Wette, Winer, Conybeare, Ellicott, Am. Bible Union, and others. Ellicott: "The emphatic position of δωρεάν apparently suggests the sharper antithesis, which the separation of the members here seems to introduce."—J. L.]

* [Estius: "*Quasi dicas, nihil operantes, sed circumoperantes.*" Robinson: "*Doing nothing, but over-doing;* not busy in work, but busy-bodies." Conybeare: "Busy bodies who do no business;" Jowett: "busy only with what is not their own business;" Webster and Wilkinson: "working nothing but overworking."—J. L.]

† [Ellicott, on Gal. vi. 9: "If ἐκκακ. exist, the difference will be very slight; ἐκκακεῖν may perhaps mean, 'to retire from fear *out* of any course of action' (nearly ἀποκακεῖν); ἐγκακεῖν, 'to behave cowardly,' 'to lose heart,' when *in* it."—J. L.]

10 forbidden a mistaken almsgiving, now glances also at the opposite danger. After many disturbing, discouraging experiences of dishonesty, unworthiness, sloth, abuse of kindnesses, it is necessary to check the growth of displeasure and distrust, lest those who are in real distress should have to suffer innocently. CHRYSOSTOM even remarks particularly, that Paul's meaning is that the idle should be punished, but not left to famish; THEODORET: Bodily support is not to be withdrawn from the delinquents, any more than from sick members; others: They should be dealt with patiently, till they are trained to self-dependence. But GROTIUS, BENGEL, RIEGER, OLSHAUSEN, LÜNEMANN, HOFMANN [ALFORD, WORDSWORTH, ELLICOTT], properly object, that the meaning of καλοποιεῖν is wider and more comprehensive, namely, *to act honorably;* LÜNEMANN: as is right and proper; BENGEL: *bene facientes, etiam manuum industria;* comp. Gal. vi. 9; and in our Epistle substantially ch. i. 11,; ii. 17. The same expositors, however, do again partially restrict the meaning in another way. LÜNEMANN thinks that, since v. 14 shows that the discourse still turns on the same theme, we are to understand it thus: Be not discouraged, but persist in not allowing yourselves to be tainted by the evil example. HOFMANN finds this too exclusively negative, and therefore takes the more exact definition this way: Become not weary in doing what is befitting, whatever, that is, conduces to the welfare of the moral community. To this we are able to assent, only with the remark, that we understand the phrase as comprehensively as possible—as including, therefore, both their own unblamable walk, steady, loving, earnest discipline (vv. 14, 15), and also a due beneficence. Suffer not yourselves by any means to become weary in the performance of your duty; act in every way as followers of God (Matt. v. 45; STARKE).

[*Lectures:* After the solemn command and exhortation in the 12th verse to the idlers, the Apostle immediately turns round again to the sound portion of the church, and seeks first, before proceeding with his disciplinary instructions, to confirm them in their more consistent course. *But ye, brethren,* whatever others may do, and great as are your discouragements within the church, as well as from without, be not weary in doing what is right. Unaffected by these examples of a restless fanaticism and ignoble indolence, do still as you have done hitherto. Lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty. And, in particular, see to it that nothing in your own opinions or sentiments be suffered to interrupt the diligent prosecution of your lawful callings. —J. L.] Wisely, plainly, in few words, Paul says whatever is needful in all directions.

6. (Vv. 14, 15.) **But if any one obey not,** &c.—What has just been said is not to be understood in the sense of a spurious complaisance that does not do what is really good. Paul speaks with the authority of truth, though not so strongly moved, because the case is not so frightful, as in 1 Cor. v. 1–5. The words διὰ τῆς ἐπιστ. are annexed by [ERASMUS] CALVIN, LUTHER, GROTIUS, BENGEL, PELT [the English margin], and others, to what follows. LUTHER: *Note that man by a letter;* and WINER as late as the 6th edition (18. 9, Note 3) marks this as at least a possible interpretation. But OLSHAUSEN, DE WETTE, LÜNEMANN, EWALD, HOFMANN [and most others] are with reason opposed to it, and connect the words (as is already done by CHRYSOSTOM, THEOPHYLACT, BEZA) with what precedes. There are these objections to the first-mentioned interpretation: 1. The article, διὰ τῆς ἐπ. (wanting only in F. G.) is not naturally explained; WINER's account of it: *in the letter which you have then to write, which I then hope to receive from you,* is certainly too artificial; and this the more so, because 2. διὰ τῆς ἐπ. from its prominent position would have an altogether unaccountable emphasis. But again, 3. the middle σημειοῦσθε would not be very suitable, since ἡμῖν might rather have been expected. And lastly, 4. as to the matter itself, it would be very strange, that Paul should have kept the churches in such a state of dependence, as to require an epistolary record of every offender, as if it were necessary that he should pronounce or at least sanction the punishment. VON GERLACH thinks that this happens only on account of the newness and inexperience of the church. Still what a paralysis of all self-dependence would this have involved! How difficult also would it have been even to comply with the injunction, since Paul certainly was not stationary always in the same place. And having just told them how they were to proceed, is it to be supposed that he again takes the matter out of their hand? he, who in a far worse case reproaches the Corinthians for not having themselves interfered (1 Cor. v. 2)? Everything, then, concurs against this explanation. But that of BENGEL and PELT is not tenable: *By means of this letter* (this very Second Epistle to the Thessalonians), *relying on it, holding it forth to him, proceed against him;* BENGEL: *notate* (*hunc*) *nota censoria;* but this is not at all the import of σημειοῦσθε. Accordingly, διὰ τῆς ἐπιστ. must be closely connected with τῷ λόγῳ ἡμῶν, although the article τῷ is not repeated; it might be omitted (WINER, § 20. 2), because the whole from τῷ to ἐπιστ. forms together but one idea. Ἡ ἐπιστ. is the present Second Epistle, as in 1 Thess. v. 27 it is the First. Hence: If any one obey not our word announced to him by the reading of this Epistle (especially vv. 10, 12); or (LÜNEMANN): my command renewed by means of this Epistle; **that** *man* σημειοῦσθε. This word in the middle signifies, *to note for one's self;* it is used of physicians who mark the symptoms of disease; also of grammarians who make remarks: σεσημείωσαι, *note this.* Hence: Note him for yourselves, mark him down, as one to be avoided. BENGEL compares the synonymous παραδειγματίζειν; CHRYSOSTOM adds as a statement of the object: *that he may not remain hidden.* The meaning is not simply: "Make him known *by* all withdrawing from him;" but: "Point him out by an agreement in the church, *in order that* this may be done." The sense is essentially the same, whether we read καὶ μὴ συναναμίγνυσθε, or μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι (the latter reading is perhaps to be explained by the influence of 1 Cor. v. 9, 11). The passage runs more correctly, if we read: Mark him for yourselves in order μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι, &c., καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐχθρὸν ἡγεῖσθε, without αὐτόν, because here likewise belongs still the previous τοῦτον; whereas the omission is not so natural, if a separate imperative with the dative has intervened. Still this is far from being conclusive. With the other reading the inaccuracy is not greater than perhaps at v. 12.* The Apostle's command is, not to mix themselves up, that is, to have no dealings, with such a one, to cultivate no fraternal intercourse with him.

* [The two cases are by no means parallel, and in neither case can the construction properly be called inaccurate.—J. L.]

It is essentially the same as had already been enjoined in v. 6, *στέλλεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπό*, &c.; except only that what was there indicated as the act of individuals appears in this instance to be a general proceeding of the great majority; if nearly all did so, and that by agreement, it was no longer an act merely of individual members, but of the church. The design of it was: **that he may be shamed**; EWALD: *that he may repent and reform.* The active is found at 1 Cor. iv. 14; here we have the passive (not middle), as in Tit. ii. 8; the middle with *τινά* (in classical Greek, *τινός*) signifies, *to regard one, fear him* (Luke xviii. 2). The passive, on the other hand, will mean: that he may be brought to the point of turning in upon himself; that he may be led by disapprobation to a knowledge of himself.—**And count** *him* **not as an enemy**; that is to say, as an enemy of God and the church; *ὡς* might be dispensed with; it makes more strongly prominent the subjective side of the conception [ELLICOTT: "*ὡς* being used (here almost pleonastically . . .) to mark the *aspect* in which he was not to be regarded."—J. L.], and is indeed a Hebraism, comp. חָשַׁב כְּ, Sept. *ἡγ. ὥσπερ* (Job xix. 11). The connection with what precedes is made by *καί*, not *δέ*. No doubt, *καί* like the Hebrew וְ frequently serves for a connection that is loose in form, while yet really marking opposition. But here it is still more simple to understand Paul as having in his eye as the main exhortation what follows *ἀλλά*, and as merely in the first instance removing with *μὴ ὡς*, &c. what might stand in the way of wholesome admonition. [ELLICOTT: "*καί* . . ., with its usual and proper force, subjoins to the previous exhortation a further one that was fully compatible with it, and in fact tended to show the real principle on which the command was given: it was not punitive, but corrective." *Revision:* "That the moral result aimed at (*ἵνα ἐντραπῇ*) may not be hindered, this, *of course*, must be the spirit and style of your discipline: *count him not*," &c.—J. L.] Accordingly: **Admonish him as a brother**; comp. 1 Thess. v. 12; properly: *set his mind right.* THEOPHYLACT: *νουθετεῖν* is not *ὀνειδίζειν*. The Apostle immediately repeats his warning against an excess of human severity. Due admonition belongs to brotherly love (Lev. xix. 17). Inconceivably capricious is the assertion of HILGENFELD (p. 262), that disorderly idlers did not attain to this superior importance until the rise of Christian heresy, or that the later writer endows mere idlers with the features of error in Christian doctrine. But in truth there is not in the text a single hint of this sort. For it would be a groundless and arbitrary abuse of ch. ii. 4, 7, to regard it as a proof of the heretical character of the *ἀτάκτως περιπατοῦντες*. Thus too we lose the instructive fact, that Paul already expresses himself with wholesome rigor against things, which we perhaps judge too loosely.

7. (V. 16.) **But may the Lord,** &c.—This closing prayer is the fourth solemn desire in this short Epistle; Paul is full of prayer and supplication. The turn of the phrase is the same as in 1 Thess. iii. 11; v. 23; 2 Thess. ii. 16. In opposition to your doing, the Lord Himself must show you and impart to you what is right. In 1 Thess. v. 23 the word is: *ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρ.*; but here: *the Lord of peace;* and that is not the Father, as WETSTEIN thinks, and HILGENFELD, who sees therein a trace of spuriousness! but Christ, who has this peace, and authority to dispense it, the Prince of peace (Is. ix. 5 [6]; John xiv. 27; xx. 19 sqq.) Why should it not have been just as possible for Paul to call Him so, as *κύριος τῆς δόξης* (1 Cor. ii. 8)?—**Give you peace**; that is something greater than merely agreement amongst yourselves, though the taming of the refractory (CALVIN) is included in it. But, in particular, the article shows that we are here to understand peace in the whole compass of its meaning—everything pertaining to it—above all, peace with God, inviolate life and salvation, and the full, joyful sense of that; finally, a peace that overspreads the entire world. LÜNEMANN remarks, as THEODORET before him, that to wish one peace at the conclusion of letters is the Christian modification of *ἔῤῥωσθε*.—May He give you this **always** (so *διὰ παντός* is to be understood likewise at Rom. xi. 10) **in every way**; comp. Phil. i. 18, *παντὶ τρόπῳ* without *ἐν*; the import of the last phrase is: *in every sense*, and therefore to a larger extent than simply in the last-mentioned relations; this thought is given with specifications in 1 Thess. v. 23. He concludes in the briefest style with the benediction: **The Lord be with you all**; therefore also with the erring.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. (Vv. 7-9.) On the manual labor of the Apostle, see at 1 Thess. ii. 9, the Doctrinal and Ethical Note 6. There the question is primarily about obviating suspicion, as if he sought his own profit; here he completes what was there said with the positive consideration, that his aim in that matter had also been to train them by his example to Christian diligence. In the preacher everything preaches, says HARMS; and many things are better taught by example than by word. Paul clearly recognizes the right of preachers of the gospel to be paid; but in his Gentile mission he ordinarily waived it, that he might be burdensome to no one, keep no one by it from the gospel, avoid even the appearance of selfishness (*I seek not yours, but you*, 2 Cor. xii. 14), and make the gospel without charge (1 Cor. ix. 18; 2 Cor. xi. 7), so that it should appear as really a gift of free grace. It is still in our day a surprise to the heathen, when missionaries do not like merchants seek for gain amongst them. The Apostle thus continued free from a dependence injurious to the gospel, kept under his body (1 Cor. ix. 29), and gave the churches an example of industry in union with godliness. His conduct formed a very marked contrast to the proud Roman contempt for manual labor, and is also a rare instance of a Divinely refreshed elasticity of spirit. It is a great thing so to walk, that the appeal can be made to the glory of God: Imitate us. It is important that the pastor and his house should in all respects preach also to the eye, and should feel a joy in setting an example. This requires a self-discipline, before which arrogance disappears. The last and highest point no doubt is: "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ" (1 Cor. xi. 1).

2. (Vv. 10-13.) Here the Apostle states the principles of a sound Christian support of the poor (comp. on 1 Thess. iv. 10, 11, and 12, Doctrinal and Ethical Notes 4-6). The rule in v. 10 goes back to the primary command in Gen. iii. 19, that curse which yet is equally a blessing (Ps. cxxviii. 2), and which is not to be hastily set aside under a pretence of spirituality, but in fact through fleshly indulgence

and sloth. An excitement that does not go deep easily brings with it such disdain of outward activity, that a person fancies himself raised in heavenly rapture above labor, almost as if it were dishonorable. Here, then, the test is very soberly applied: Art thou raised also above eating? like the angels (BENGEL)? In the Old Testament, especially the Proverbs (comp. also Ps. xxxvii. 21), industry is more largely spoken of; in the New Testament the heavenly calling preponderates, but this, wherever it is necessary, with a very plain and sober protest against misapprehension and abuse. The gospel cannot be degraded into a mere hod-carrier for civil uses, but no less does it repel all such noxious perversity as would bring 1. an unmerited reproach on Divine truth, and 2. damage to the heart of the erring themselves, a sore recovery from a brief debauch. God, it is true, cares for the birds and the lilies, but for them according to the nature of birds and lilies, and for men, in the way that is good for men. In our text the sharpest discipline is appointed for idleness, even of the refined, seemingly pious sort: it is to reap its natural fruit, namely, want and hunger. So then, you are to work; not all with your hands; head-work also is work. Even those who give should observe the principle of v. 10, and not by an improper bestowal of charity out of their own or the public means injure the recipient, and confirm him in his sin. Alms is ἐλεημοσύνη; but it is an evil tenderness, to foster an immoral mendicity. What a repudiation is there in our passage of the mendicant orders, who made their τάξις to consist in living ἀτάκτως! BENGEL inquires: What would Paul have said to such vows? not to mention that such beggars affect to be the greatest saints. The dignity of the individual, and inevitably also his religious independence, are depressed and enslaved by the enjoyment of alms received in indolence. A different thing is innocent poverty; as a Divine humiliation, it may exert a salutary influence. STOCKMEYER: The Apostle does not say that whoever does not work shall not eat. That were harsh and unmerciful. For many a man does not work, who yet should eat; the old, who have passed their life in labor, and whose strength for labor has thus been exhausted, these have an honorable place reserved for them at the table of the prosperous; those in like manner, who through bodily or mental infirmity are incapacitated for work, have a free seat at the table of love; and, lastly, such as would fain labor, but just at present they find no work; they themselves beg: "Give us not bread, give us work; we desire to eat our own bread;" to them work should be given, but, until that is found, they should not be left to perish. Only to those who *will* not work does the Apostle's injunction apply. There is no reason to fear that any one will thus die of hunger. Before it comes to that, hunger will drive to labor, and for the idler that is the greatest kindness, indeed his salvation. To give blindly, wherever we are applied to, is frequently to do, not a favor, but an injury. It is true, however, that little is done by merely turning away from the idler, and regarding him as an enemy of society. He is still a brother, though an erring one, who deserves to be shamed and censured in earnest (v. 15), and, if we are not yet at liberty to open to him the liberal hand, we are not to refuse him the hand of brotherly compassion, that seeks to lead him in the right way.—Amongst those who are suffered to eat, without having to work, children also are to be numbered; not, however, the rich. STOCKMEYER explains how the blessing of a quiet, orderly condition becomes ours only through faithful, unassuming labor. Many persons, indeed, are so burdened with work, that we might well desire for them more leisure for the tranquil culture of the inner man. Still, less depends on freedom in that respect, than on the right direction of the heart. And when labor itself exerts a wholesome influence on the soul of man, it leads it from dissipation into a state of collectedness, from caprice to orderliness, from bustle to calmness, so that indeed during labor it finds time for self-introspection, and for sanctifying and strengthening itself in looking upwards to God. Idleness, on the other hand, has precisely the opposite effect. Though the body enjoys a lazy quiet, the spirit roves the more restlessly to and fro, and becomes the prey of the most unregulated thoughts and desires. And then there is work of the most various kinds, from the cultivation of the soil into fruitful fields, on through all the relations of life, to the culture of man's spirit and heart itself. In this task every one should be interested, every one on his part by orderly activity contributing to the good of the whole. Those, therefore, to whose lot wealth has fallen, without their having needed to earn it, have before men a certain right to eat their bread even without labor; but not before God, if they would be His good stewards, nor yet before themselves, if they desire their own profit. This must be urgently impressed on their heart: Find work for yourselves along with your bread; if you have no need to work for yourselves, work for others, work for the general good; only then will the blessing rest on your bread.—Amidst the many disappointments which one experiences in intercourse with the indigent, it may become a difficult thing for the naturally selfish heart to preserve its love. It must be made a matter of earnest study, to be evermore a cheerful giver. But on the whole (STOCKMEYER) there is so much to make us weary in well-doing. Sometimes it seems to us that the work required of us is really too much; sometimes it seems to be as it were in vain, and crowned with no result; sometimes even, instead of encouragement, we meet with nothing but misconception and ingratitude. But how is it that the Apostle can forbid us to become weary? We become so without wishing to do so. Yes, but one may wish to get the better of his weariness, and in this we are aided by the fountain of refreshment and strength, to which we are pointed in that reference to the love of God which appoints unto us an eternal Sabbath, and to the patience of Christ, who had to experience still greater ingratitude, and seemed to labor with even less result, than we (v. 5).

3. (Vv. 6, 11, 14, 15.) The injunction here given by the Apostle is, after the extraordinary judgment on Ananias and Sapphira, and the penal sentence on Simon the sorcerer, the first example of Church discipline. It is the more worthy of notice on account of the Apostle's subjecting to it an error, which we probably should not have regarded so seriously. With a keen spiritual insight he practises the *principiis obsta*, as in 1 Cor. xi. 3 sqq.; where he resists with such marked emphasis the first stirrings of a Women's Emancipation. On Church discipline comp. GODET's *Report* in the Swiss Reformed Preachers' Association at Neuenburg, 1850, and FABRI on *Kirchenzucht im Sinn und Geist des Evangeliums*, Stuttgart, 1854. Both agree in proving Church discipline of a genuine and thoroughly evangelical kind

to be an act of severity proceeding from love, and in recognizing in the historical development of excommunication a very unevangelical penalty, and one rather befitting the police. Both incline somewhat too much towards reducing all Church discipline to a cure of souls. The ground-text from which they properly start is Matt. xviii. 15 sqq. As we are to give no offence to our neighbors (v. 6 sqq.), so just as little are we to sin against them by neglecting to admonish them. It is a brother who is liable to censure. If he will be a Christian, and still persists in a sin that is inconsistent with his Christian profession, he should be convicted of this contradiction, first privately, and, if that does not avail, then by taking with us one or two witnesses. Neither in the case of the first complainant, nor of these further witnesses, is there any assertion of the need of an official character. Only they must be Christians, whose hearts are affected by the injury done to the Christian calling. If again he hear not the two or three, then tell it to the Church,—her, namely, whose establishment and invincibleness were spoken of in ch. xvi. 18. And if he hear not the Church also, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican. In the earlier stages a protest was made from his confession against his sin, but now it is from his sin, since he will not forsake it, against his confession. *Let him be to thee as a heathen*, that is, to thee, the first complainant; nor is this to be at once generalized. But certainly there is now further connected herewith a promise given by the Lord to His disciples, that whatever they bind or loose on earth shall be ratified likewise in heaven. They have made God's cause theirs; God now makes their cause His; and, if they have no other weapons than the prayers of two or three gathered together in the name of Jesus, He will hear their prayers, and will cause the binding and loosing to act with power.

In 1 Cor. v. we meet with a case, in which Paul reproaches the church for not having taken measures against a peculiarly grievous scandal. There too he by no means makes the office-bearers especially responsible. There too the man, whom discipline should have reached, is one who desires to pass for a brother, and nevertheless holds fast stubbornly to his sin (v. 11). In that instance Paul omits the first and second exhortations, because in a notoriously bad case these were no longer admissible. But he insists that the church, to be free from participation in the guilt, should have broken off all intercourse with the impenitent sinner (vv. 9, 11); and he further declares, by virtue of his apostolic authority, yet in such a way that it appears to be the rule which the Corinthians should have executed, that he delivers that wicked person unto Satan; he does not mean, to damnation, but, if possible, for salvation, namely, for the destruction of the flesh, to a bodily disease, or some such trial, that the spirit may be saved (v. 5; comp. 1 Tim. i. 20 [1 Cor. xi. 30]). The suspension of intercourse answers to the word, *let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican;* the delivery to Satan, on the other hand, is a special mode of binding, and is effected through the prayer of faith, invoking, when necessary, a terrible punishment as a means of salutary discipline. This, of course, can be imitated in a very evil and fleshly style; but however often fanatical priests may have practised such an abuse, this does not annul the legitimate use, that keeps within the limits of the word and spirit of Scripture. Men are required, who really have the Spirit (John xx. 22, 23), or who pray sincerely in the name of Jesus (Matt. xviii. 19, 20); only such can practise especially this extreme measure. And then it is just as important, not to neglect a timely restoration; as the Apostle sets us the example, when he will not allow that the unhappy man be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow, and so destroyed by Satan (2 Cor. ii. 7, 11).

In Thessalonica the question was not about anything so unusually wicked, as there in Corinth. For this reason, there is as yet in the meanwhile no mention of a delivery to Satan, but simply of the rupture of brotherly intimacy. As Bengel says, the affair was a *labes quæ non nisi lautas animas tentat.* And therefore the offenders here are not to be regarded as publicans and heathens, but as brethren who must be admonished, and who accordingly must even be told what there is against them. They must be dealt with as diseased, not as amputated, members.

It has been asked whether in the suspension of brotherly intercourse, which according to 1 Cor. v. 11 was a refusal to eat together, carried with it an exclusion from the Holy Supper. Godet will not admit of the inference, that, if not even ordinary fellowship at table was granted to him, then much less was the Supper; this he thinks not at all self-evident, the first being a matter of personal allowance, the second not so. But the distinction is perhaps too nice, and for the apostolic age especially untenable. A publican or a heathen might be present at the preaching of the word, but he had no part in the fraternal repast. The shrine of the covenant was for no one who was delivered unto Satan. Nor indeed was the Supper at that time observed as a separate act of worship; it formed the conclusion of the love-feast or agape, and the two together were called δεῖπνον κυριακόν. If the one half of this was refused, then, of course, so was the other. On this point, therefore, Fabri also does not agree with Godet. What most readily admits still of a doubt in our passage is, how far the discipline reached, since it is here said expressly: *not as an enemy, but as a brother admonish him.* At any rate, however, the apostolic writings do not anticipate an insolent demand for the Supper on the part of those under censure, but repentance unto life.

Then as to the manner in which the church declares itself, that is not, it is true, clearly defined. When Jesus says: *Should he not hear the church*, the church must have found some way of expressing its mind. The mode is left undetermined; but our passage shows that, as soon as the church as a whole, or by a large majority, obeyed the word of the Apostle, the στέλλεσθαι, an individual affair in the first instance, came to be a σημειοῦσθαι on the part of the church. Because nowadays we do not generally have churches, that could in this way harmoniously express themselves in the Spirit of the Lord, we are not at liberty to deny the existence of such a state of things even in the apostolic age. At present there may be no possibility of anything much beyond the private care of souls; but this does not prove that church discipline is essentially nothing but the private care of souls. Nor is the design of it by any means solely the reformation of the offender. When the Basle Confession says: *es bannet die christenliche Kylch nit dann umb Besserung willen* [*the Christian Church does not excommunicate for the sake of amendment*], it also supplements this onesidedness by exhibiting the other object: *damit die Kilch jr Gestalt sovil möglich on Masen* (*ohne*

Flecken) *behalte* [*that the Church may preserve its aspect as free from blemishes as possible*]. In other words, the restoration of the erring person is certainly the first thing aimed at by the genuine earnestness of love; but whether he repents or not, it is just as important to save the church from a spreading scandal, and the church conscience from moral stupefaction; and not less so, finally, is the removal of any such stain as would imperil the outward missionary calling of the church (1 Cor. v. 1; x. 32). Discipline, therefore, contemplates something beyond the mere influence on individuals. It is, as NITZSCH says, a judicial act. So it is understood likewise in the Articles of Schmalkald, III. 9, where the lesser excommunication is very briefly spoken of, for the purpose, chiefly, of pressing the distinction between it and civil penalties; and just so in the Heidelberg Catechism, Quest. 85.

How is it with us to-day? By a manifold unchristian banning and cursing; by an admixture of civil penalties, of such, in particular, as by disgracing exasperated; and by a wicked distinction of classes, there has so much damage been done to the practice of ecclesiastical discipline, that a zealous rigorism, which would reëstablish the old methods, has here the least possible prospect of any result whatever. But, while in our circumstances the setting aside of an unevangelical Church police merits the highest approval, it is not so with the widespread relaxation of all discipline, and the resentment of many against whatever looks like it. When an officer of Berne was required to see that his soldiers, after a night riotously passed in drinking and whoring, were on the next morning without any rebuke whatever ordered to the Holy Supper, it is conceivable that the wounded conscience might be driven even to separation. And yet it is not said that this expedient was the right one. But a private proceeding, which without arrogance testifies an unwillingness to be made a partaker of another's guilt through intercourse with the sinner, as if we favored his sin (2 John 10, 11), that is the duty incumbent first of all on the individual. It will be blessed, the more one is willing to suffer for the truth. The στέλλεσθαι, performed by one or a few, when many are not yet ripe for it, is an act of fidelity to the apostolic word; and a prayer of two or three has in this case a special promise from the Lord. ROOS: The directions are left still standing in the Bible, if peradventure it may be possible for small societies here and there to make use of them; and we wait for better times, when their use will be more complete and general.

4. (V. 16.) ROOS: When animosity was mingled with exhortation, or self-willed people despised it, it might produce discord. Paul therefore wishes for them peace in the heart, in the family, and the church; peace with the Lord, with their stumbling brethren, and also, so far as possible, with those without.—Not by covering up what is evil, but by overcoming it, is true peace to be obtained. The sin that troubles it must be extinguished. But that we should have to contend with our neighbors should not cease, however necessary it may be, to be painful to us. Peace must ever be our aim. A cheerful warfare in the spirit of peace only the Lord of peace can give.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

V. 6 sqq. in connection with v. 5. ROOS: A directing of the heart into the love of God is necessary, when we are to denounce something that is opposed to the glory of God, and abolish it in ourselves or others; and a directing of the heart into the patience of Christ is necessary, if, according to the injunction in v. 15, zeal is not to be carried too far.

V. 6. Disorder may arise in the best churches.—*Berl. Bib.*: To command in the name of Jesus Christ requires the humility and long-suffering of Jesus.

CALVIN: Those live disorderly, who reflect not on the end of their creation; those orderly, who walk according to the commandments of God.—ROOS: These people were not idle, but they did not attend to their own business, but meddled with the affairs of others, and so did not maintain the necessary quietness. Their work, accordingly, was no work, but a restless occupation that was troublesome to others. They ran around (DIEDRICH) in restlessness, excitement, inaction, and eccentricity.—CALVIN calls such sponging drones.—HEUBNER: If one found no companions, that of itself must be an end of his enjoyment.

Vv. 7-9. CALVIN: Our teaching has much more weight, when we lay no burden on others but what we bear ourselves.—CHRYSOSTOM: Talking is easy for every one; the difficulty is in acting, when there is need for it.—HEUBNER: A position of high consideration often misleads into taking undue liberties. —DIEDRICH: (The Apostle acted thus) that they might see, that a Christian should work and earn his own bread.—Mental labor is by many not reckoned to be really labor.—CALVIN: All men are not so reasonable, as to acknowledge what is due to a minister of the word; many grudge them their living, as if they were idlers.—Paul insists on the right, but shows them (DIEDRICH) that he would rather do double work, than accept of a gratuitous support.—HEUBNER: The common maxim is: I do not put myself to inconvenience for the sake of others.—THE SAME: True freedom restricts itself.

V. 10. HEUBNER: Every morsel admonishes: Dost thou deserve to taste?

Vv. 11, 12. Περιεργάζεσθαι is in French: *faire des riens.*—DIEDRICH: Such fanatical, labor-shirking folks fancy that they are beyond all others zealous, pious, and holy. At such fanaticism weak people are accustomed readily to stare.—STÄHELIN: It is sinful indolence, when one does not Christianly labor in an honorable calling. But that calling is honorable, which in itself is not displeasing to God, nor scandalous to our neighbor, but in which we are led by God to stand, and to which we are permitted to ask His assistance. Idleness and Christianity do not agree. The more pious the Christian, the more diligent the worker.—STARKE: He who without necessity eats other people's bread is no better than a thief.—DIEDRICH: Our glory and our heavenly treasure we have within; we can therefore perform all outward labor, and should do so willingly, that we may serve our time by what is temporal. They who belong to the eternal Lord should not beg or steal what is temporal. Thus (in such a seemingly lowly way) will God perfect us for the highest glory.

[SCOTT: A slothful man is a scandal to any society, but most to a religious society.—*Lectures*: What a practical, reasonable, orderly thing Christianity is! It would have every man at work—at work of some kind—and every man at his own work.—THE SAME: *And eat their own bread!* How often

has that one noble phrase quickened the pulse, and nerved the arm, of honest industry! It has done more for the poor of Christendom, in Protestant countries at least, than all the devices of philanthropy and all the provisions of law.—J. L.]

V 13. ZWINGLI: Many call those good works, which are not at all good. Nothing is good, but what comes from God.—DIEDRICH: Become not weary in this good way of a sober, discreet walk.—ROOS: (Paul's wish is that) they should not drive this precept (vv. 10–12) too far, and, if those brethren should perhaps be unable fully to earn their own bread, they are not to be reluctant to help them.—CHRYSOSTOM: It is not the giving, but the misconduct of the beggar, that should cause us pain.—*Berl. Bib.*: Fret not thyself because of evil-doers (Ps. xxxvii. 1, 8).—RIEGER: The Apostle had frequent occasion to warn against despondency (2 Cor. iv. 1, 16; Gal. vi. 9; Eph. iii. 13).

Vv. 14, 15. Apostolic Church discipline presupposes genuine churches, wherein the rule of God's word is recognized, and those who have the Spirit decide. CHRYSOSTOM already bewails the decay of discipline.—ROOS: Paul demands obedience, and hints at still greater severity. He writes at one time mildly, at another sharply, according to the exigencies of persons and cases as they occurred. He desires to draw the upright Thessalonians also into fellowship in his zeal.—Church discipline should not merely exclude gross scorners, but should also hold members living in the dissipation of inactivity to quietness and work.—ROOS: Penitent shame makes all right again.—It looks well, when the few disorderly persons blush at being put to shame by the reserve of others.—RIEGER: Many a man in his self-love and fond fancy supposes that he hits it far better than others; but by the withdrawal of confidence and intercourse he must be made to feel, that he has reason to be ashamed.—CALVIN: Not flattery, but exhortation, is the true sign of love.—ROOS: Matters stand ill in a Christian church, when we are not able and willing to shame disorderly persons by withdrawing from them, and treating them with reserve. In such a case love has not salt enough.—In how many places is the mass composed of the listless or the malevolent!—ROOS: Who will make them blush, when they are defiant, and not ashamed of wickedness?

V. 16. RIEGER: We need peace in the Church, in the commonwealth, in households, marriages, families, trades, in regard to eating one's own bread, in regard to opinions, wherein one is often puffed up against another. But (VON GERLACH): Peace, not at the cost of the holy war against impurities, but just *by means of* such a conflict.

Vv. 6–16. STOCKMEYER: The word of God would especially take under its discipline and care our inner man, and implant in us a heavenly mind, but not as if earthly relations were something altogether indifferent, or even something so low, that the Christian is not at all to meddle with them. Rather, the heavenly mind is to show itself in those very things (Luke xvi. 10).

---

3. CH. III. 17, 18.

He concludes with a parting Salutation and Benediction under his own hand.

17 The salutation of Paul with mine own hand;[1] which is the [a] token[2] in
18 every epistle: so I write. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ *be* with you all.
Amen.[3]

[1] V. 17.—[The Greek is: Ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου, which Riggenbach renders: *Der Gruss mit meiner Paulushand.* Our English Version gives it in three forms: "The salutation of *me* Paul with mine own hand" (1 Cor. xvi. 21; and so Ellicott in our text); "The salutation by the hand of me Paul" (Col. iv. 18); "The salutation of Paul with mine own hand" (2 Thess. iii. 17). The second mode was adopted in my *Revision* of this Epistle.—J. L.]

[2] V. 17.—[σημεῖον, without the article; and so De Wette, Lünemann, Conybeare, Ellicott, and others.—J. L.]

[3] V. 18.—Most authorities give ἀμήν; it is wanting in B., Sin. *a prima manu*, and some others. Grotius decides, that *Amen* was added by the church, when the Epistle was read. [It is cancelled by Tischendorf and Alford. Riggenbach likewise omits it.—J. L.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. (V. 17.) **The salutation of Paul with mine own hand;** Παύλου is in apposition to ἐμῇ, which indeed as to sense is the same thing as μου. Hitherto, therefore, Paul had dictated; and that was his custom (Rom. xvi. 22); though Gal. vi. 12 [11] purports otherwise.—**Which is the [a] token;** ὅ might be explained by attraction, the subject being conformed to the gender of the predicate; but it is better to understand it thus: *which*, to wit, the ἀσπάζεσθαι τῇ ἐμῇ χειρί.—**In every epistle;** on which THEOPHYLACT already remarks: ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ἐπιστ. τῇ ἴσως πεμφθησομένῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἢ καὶ ἁπλῶς ἐν πάσῃ τῇ πρὸς οὕστινας. [ELLICOTT: "Apparently with reference to every future epistle (τῇ πρὸς οὕστινας δήποτε, THEOPH. 2) which the Apostle might hereafter deem it necessary so to authenticate,—not merely those he might have contemplated writing *to Thessalonica* (THEOPH. 1, LÜNEM.); for consider 1 Cor. xvi. 21 and Col. iv. 18. If it be urged that these last mentioned are the only Epistles in which the autograph attestation seems to have found a place, it may be reasonably answered that the πάσῃ must be understood relatively of every Epistle that was sent in such a way or under such circumstances as to have needed it. All the other Epistles (except 1 Cor., Col., which have the σημεῖον, and 1 Thess., which was sent before circumstances proved it to be necessary) are fairly shown both by DE WETTE and by ALFORD *in loc.* to have either been delivered by emissaries (2 Corinth., Phil.), to bear marks (Gal. vi. 11, and perhaps the doxology in Rom., Eph.), or to be of such a general character (Rom.? Eph.? and those to individuals) as to have rendered such a formal attestation unnecessary."—J. L.]—**So I**

write; not, that is, *these words*, as if there were cause for surprise, if we meet with them again only in 1 Cor. and Col.; it is not *ταῦτα*, but *οὕτως*, and De Wette's inquiry, why the words recur in the smallest number of the other Epistles, is quite superfluous. He says merely: This is my handwriting (see the Introduction to Thess., p. 114). Grotius, Bengel and others, thought of an intricate monogram, difficult of imitation; but that is untenable, and not consonant to antiquity. It may be further asked, whether by the autograph salutation Paul means v. 17, or v. 18, or both together. Very improbable is Diedrich's idea: The salutation and benediction in v. 16 are written by my hand. The word is referred to v. 18 by Chrysostom (ἀσπασμὸν καλεῖ τὴν εὐχήν), Theodoret, Theophylact; by Lünemann, on the other hand, only to v. 17, ἀσπασμός, he thinks, being something different from a benediction. But probably this is to distinguish too nicely, and besides it is scarcely to be supposed, that Paul should have written v. 17 with his own hand, and then again have dictated v. 18. Nor does Lünemann assume this, but regards both verses as autographical. In that case, however, the separation between salutation and benediction also fails, as Hofmann properly remarks. The closing salutation might be compressed, or extended. The Apostle wrote it himself, but not always in the same words, nor always expressly drawing attention to it: ὁ ἀσπ., &c. In this place it is the salutation of love, and at the same time a precautionary measure for the future. After what has been said, Lünemann's other inference is likewise untenable, that, if Paul here says for the first time: οὕτως γράφω, and thus shows that his handwriting was still unknown to the Thessalonians, then in the First Epistle he had not written the salutation. But he might there too have written the words of benediction, and merely not have found occasion to make express reference to his handwriting. So Hofmann with reason. Utterly groundless is it, when Grotius also infers from our passage that this Epistle was the first, since, had they already received one at an earlier period, this notice would have been unnecessary.—A thorough knowledge of Paul's customary procedure could only be got from the original letters. But we know enough to say, that to regard the warding off of a pernicious forgery, as just a mark by which a forger betrays himself, is the most perverse abuse of our passage.*

2. (V. 18.) **The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all**; as in the First Epistle, only that here *all* is expressed; no one, therefore, even of the delinquents is excluded.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

(Vv. 17, 18.) Paul takes great pains even for the *fides humana* of Scripture. The interest which faith has in scientific criticism consists in this, that it must be of importance for us to place confidence in nothing that is precarious. Now the original apostolic manuscript is not accessible to us, but we are referred to a series of intermediate processes, through which copies of the original are delivered to us, and, were we obliged to verify the trustworthiness of these mediums, we should remain in a painful uncertainty. But, on the whole, it is only through the *fides divina* that the *fides humana* first receives its full authentication. Only because this Epistle also bears the stamp of the Spirit of God, is the assertion of the writer, which we read at v. 17, worthy of credit, and it becomes a moral impossibility for us to impeach it as a falsehood. Not the Apostle's handwriting, which we no longer have before us, but the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, which pervades the Epistle, is for us the decisive seal of authenticity.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Stähelin: Truly this is also the mark of all those who are a living epistle of Christ (2 Cor. iii. 2, 3), that the grace of their Lord Jesus, whom they have received in faith and love to their justification, sanctification, and salvation, is by them continually embraced and held fast as their souls' only comfort and joy.

* [Webster and Wilkinson: "We have here a strong proof that St. Paul regarded himself and desired the churches to regard him as the sole author of his Epistles, whatever might be the association of the superscription, or the corresponding phraseology of the composition."—J. L.]

THE END OF THESSALONIANS.

THE

TWO EPISTLES OF PAUL

TO

TIMOTHY.

BY

J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR IN ORDINARY OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF UTRECHT.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, WITH ADDITIONS,

BY

E. A. WASHBURN, D.D.,

RECTOR OF CALVARY CHURCH, NEW YORK,

AND

E. HARWOOD, D.D.,

RECTOR OF TRINITY CHURCH, NEW HAVEN.

NEW YORK:

CHARLES SCRIBNER & CO., 654 BROADWAY.

1870.

THE TROW & SMITH
BOOK MANUFACTURING COMPANY
46, 48, 50 Greene Street, N. Y.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

It is not without a degree of reluctance, that I here offer to the friends and patrons of the *Bible-work* of LANGE my commentary on the Pastoral Epistles and that to Philemon, which I have undertaken by the wish of the honored Editor. It lay, however, in the nature of the subject, that this new task, although of less extent, must present greater difficulties than the treatment of the Gospel of Luke. A Pauline epistle demands a labor less pleasant and easy than one of the synoptic Gospels; a pastoral epistle, again, is more difficult than many others; and, still more, a meeting with the errorists of the apostolic time is never so agreeable as the study of the delightful scenes in the life of Jesus. He, however, who has shared the pleasures of this common work, should not refuse its burthens; and he who, like the author of this commentary, has seen his life divided for years between the tasks of theological literature and a laborious official charge, may have gained in part, perhaps, a practical preparation for the treatment of these epistles, which are an exhaustless mine for all the ministers of the Gospel in our own time, and, if possible, beyond even other portions of the apostolic legacy. I have thus, then, put my hand to this work; and it is indeed less difficult in this respect, that I have, after earlier doubts, become strongly convinced of the genuineness of the pastoral letters, and yet more of their composition during the second imprisonment of Paul at Rome.

This last conviction I must have wholly given up, had I been able to agree with the main arguments of a work* which I met with shortly before finishing my own. I refer to the striking book of Dr. C. W. OTTO, in which the theory of one only imprisonment of Paul at Rome is again keenly defended, and the opinion which forms the basis of the present commentary opposed at almost every point. This thorough monograph on one of the most confused points of introductory criticism has led me to a new study of the position, which I had reached not without much conflict and toil; and had the learned author convinced me of my mistake in this point, I would not have hesitated to erase my almost completed work. This, however, is not the case; nay, I do not believe that Dr. OTTO's work, deserving as it is in many respects, will lead many writers of introductions and exegetes to his conclusion. We must admire, doubtless, in many points the striking power of combination shewn by the author; and especially acknowledge the masterly way in which he has arranged and summed up the external proofs for the genuineness of the pastoral epistles. Yet, on the other side, his whole argument confirms anew my opinion, that the genuineness of these epistles cannot be maintained, if we consider the second imprisonment of the Apostle a mere legend. The method in which Dr. OTTO seeks to prove that the first epistle to Timothy was written on occasion of the Corinthian discords, as little satisfies us as his exposition of 2 Tim. iv. 6–8; according to which the Apostle expresses only his deep sorrow, with not a word of premonition concerning his death; and we are thus to infer that he speaks of the end of his missionary labor, not of his coming martyrdom. We may fully grant, that there is a unity in principle among all the erroneous teachers opposed in the Pauline epistles, without drawing thence the consequences, which the author admits in regard to questions of introduction and of chronology. We at least are still of the opinion, that between the prediction of the errorists, whom Paul looked for in the future (Acts xx. 29), and their open appearance and activity at Ephesus, there must be a greater period than that claimed by Dr. OTTO. The whole direction and management of the community is more systematized and developed after the first letter to Timothy, than at the time of the first imprisonment of the Apostle at Rome; and, besides, we do not know how to explain the

* The historic relations of the Pastoral Epistles examined anew. Dr. C. W. OTTO. Leipzig. 1860.

various *personalia* in the second epistle to Timothy, unless we admit a second imprisonment. The position of the case is not, that to save the genuineness of the epistles, we accept in a quite arbitrary way the hypothesis of a second imprisonment, and thus bring in our proof *a tutiori;* but on the contrary, that in these epistles, of whose genuineness the external evidence is enough, we meet with the record of facts, for which no conceivable place can be found in Paul's life, so far as it is given in the Acts of the Apostles; and which therefore in and by themselves compel us to the decision, that the Apostle was released from his prison (Acts xxviii. 30, 31). For this reason the second epistle to Timothy is a sufficient proof of the second imprisonment; and it is yet further strongly confirmed through the church tradition, although not beyond all doubt. We fear that the Author has not done sufficient justice to this last point, although we readily acknowledge that he has avoided with greater foresight many of the rocks on which we have seen WIESELER stranded.

Yet this is not the place to speak of all the particulars of a still unsettled inquiry. We heartily hope that others will give to the book of Dr. OTTO the thorough judgment which it claims in every view. Perhaps in the present case we have been so much the harder to convince, because we formerly held more or less the same position, and have since renounced it. In addition, we must be content to point to the remarks of Dr. LANGE on this question in his article *Paulus* in HERZOG'S *Real encyclopädie* [vol. xi. p. 289 ff.]; and above all to the small, but weighty essay of L. RUFFET, *St. Paul, sa double captivité à Rome.* Paris, 1860. Without apparently equalling Dr. OTTO in learning, the author of this last-named *brochure* satisfies us far more with the result of his inquiry, and we gladly subscribe his own words; "In a question of this kind we cannot ask a mathematical certainty; it only concerns us to know on the side of which hypothesis are the more probabilities: and after a serious study, undertaken with strong prepossessions against the idea of a double imprisonment of St. Paul, we must range ourselves in the last result with GIESELER, LANGE, GUERICKE and NEANDER, notwithstanding the learned pages of REUSS, WIESELER, and EDMOND DE PRESSENSE"—we will add—of OTTO.

Beyond this, I have little to say as to the editorship of this part of the Bible-work. It will, I hope, be found an advantage, that I have sought to make not a very scientific book of exegesis, but a practical commentary, designed *non coquis, sed convivis.* Discussions are for this reason avoided as far as possible, and only results given. The self-denial, which here and there was necessary in the treatment of a difficult subject within a few words, where I often had more to say and should perhaps have said it, I have willingly borne on account of the aim of this edition. In points of difference regarding doctrine and confessions, it was not hard for me to express myself with moderation, although, as I hope, with sufficient decision. Moreover, I have designed to give not only *multa,* but *multum.* As to the epistle to Philemon in conclusion, it is also a kind of pastoral letter, a great, unique example of the apostle's pastoral labor and cure of souls. Regarded from another side, it would perhaps be best treated together with the epistle to the Colossians. But here the isagogic point of view should not be decisive. In a practical Bible-work the epistle will be sought in its accustomed place; and as an evidence of apostolic practice it stands justly there. Thus I must decide, as Paul did before, to receive Onesimus, as otherwise a homeless wanderer. The wish of the Editor to add the pages on Philemon as a sort of appendix to the rest, has been therefore readily complied with. A request from so esteemed a source cannot easily be denied. My honored friend Dr. LANGE has now, therefore, the personal responsibility, should any think that he has perhaps laid on me more of the Bible-work than my shoulders can well bear.

I ought not indeed to hope that my commentary on these epistles will bring such unlooked for and happy results as my Luke, a new edition of which is in the press. May it only please the Lord to crown with his blessing these weak efforts for the spread of his kingdom; and that He may grant me as well as my brethren in the ministry, to become through this study of the pastoral letters, what Paul proposed to Timothy: *σπούδασον σεαυτὸν δόκιμον παραστῆσαι τῷ θεῷ, ἐργάτην ἀνεπαίσχυντον, ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας.*

J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE.

ROTTERDAM, *November,* 1860.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

The intimation of the respected publishers, that a new edition of my "Pastoral Epistles" has become necessary; and the added request, that it might be prepared for the press as soon as possible, came to me at an inconvenient time, when I was called to an important charge in my official position, which claimed almost exclusively my time and strength. I have, however, done what I could; and a comparison of both editions will readily show, that this last may rightly be called "a newly corrected and improved" one. All at least, which seemed to me worthy and needful to add after the completion of the first, I have fairly incorporated; slight errors in form or matter have been corrected in various places; and although the main idea, from which I believed I must start, remains unchanged, yet here and there a position has been more closely defined, modified or completed. Had more decisions of any importance suggested themselves to me, they might indeed have led to a larger revision. It appears to me a just duty to express my thanks for a treasure, as unexpected as it is invaluable, which I have found in the Codex Sinaiticus for the settlement of the text of this edition in doubtful passages. It would not have been difficult for me, to have given a marked enlargement to the homiletic annotations by the help of the earlier or later literature of the pulpit: but I thought it the main purpose of this work, that the *ne quid nimis* should be kept in mind. I wished as little a *fons* as a *pons*, but simply a useful guide for personal study in homiletics. With this view, I now give the work anew into the hands of our present and future practical divines, with the prayer, that the study of the Pastoral Epistles may increase and hallow their capacity and love for the service of the Word, which preaches redemption.

J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE.

Utrecht, *June*, 1868.

THE PASTORAL LETTERS.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PASTORAL LETTERS.

As there appear in heaven solitary stars, and again larger groups which form together one shining constellation, so we find the like phenomena in the heaven of Holy Writ. Here are many distinct writings, which can hardly be compared with each other, by the side of others which have such a common relation and character as more or less divides them from the former. Thus of the thirteen Epistles whose authorship is usually ascribed to the Apostle Paul, there are several wholly independent (*e. g.* 1 Cor. or Phil.), while, again, others more or less complete each other (*e. g.* Rom. and Gal.; Eph. and Col.), and still others form a small cycle of apostolic writings, as is the case with the three Pastoral Epistles. Even from the most superficial view of these Epistles it is clear, that in many relations they show different features from the remaining letters of the same Apostle; and hence it is well worth our study to understand their peculiarities fully at the outset.

While all the other letters, except the private one to Philemon, are addressed to whole communities, these three are sent to individuals, co-workers with St. Paul in the Gospel. As a whole they treat chiefly of the same objects, the preaching of the Word and the organization of the Body; and thus far are rightly called by their usual name of Pastoral Epistles. They contain rules for the pastoral office of Timothy and Titus; rules flowing from the heart of a true shepherd, and thus entirely fitted to form these disciples after the likeness of the Chief Shepherd of the flock (1 Pet. v. 4). They bear, therefore, less an official than a confidential character, and have many expressions, many turns of language, which are not found, or at least in the same manner, throughout the other writings of this Apostle. While their style is less fresh and life-like than that of the earlier letters, they have a deeper tone of fatherly friendship and tenderness, and betray the most heartfelt anxiety not only for the communities, at whose head Timothy and Titus were placed, but also for their own spiritual and temporal welfare. Although, again, nothing is wanting in them in regard to the weightiest relations of Christian doctrine, yet these three Epistles bear a practical rather than a doctrinal coloring, and are directed, no less than the other letters of the Apostle, toward the demands of the time. Many momentous hints, warnings, precepts and forebodings are addressed to both these young overseers of the community, and through them to the whole Body, although these letters were not designed, like most of the others (Col. iv. 16), for public reading. They furnish us in their complete form a deep insight into the heart of the Apostle, whom we meet here in the closing period of his life bowed down more than ever before by many persecutions and toils; yet filled on the one hand with glowing zeal against the foes of the Divine kingdom, on the other with the inmost fatherly love toward both his spiritual sons in the faith. They clearly exhibit, at the same time, the feeling with which he looked forward to the impending dismemberment of the Church, as well as to his own near end. More than the other Epistles, they remind us of the Apostle's word, that he has "the treasure of the Gospel in earthen vessels;" but they show, also, the truth of what follows, "that the excellency of the power may be of

God and not of us" (2 Cor. iv. 7). Among the three, there are, again, two which have a strong likeness to each other; the first to Timothy and that to Titus, although the relation of the Apostle was much closer to the former than to the latter. The second to Timothy so far differs from both, that it may be called, so to speak, the apostolic-prophetic testament of the great Apostle of the Gentiles; his legacy to his friend and in him at the same time to the whole Church. After this view of the characteristics, we need no longer postpone the inquiry, whether the genuineness of these Pastoral Epistles, and, indeed, that of the whole three, can be defended on satisfactory grounds.

§ 2. GENUINENESS.

The external proofs for the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles, apart from the tradition of the ancient Church, are as numerous and undoubted as for the other writings of St. Paul. We will name those which appear to us the weightiest, without denying the importance of others, here omitted. We find citations from, or clear allusion to passages in the First Epistle to Timothy, in CLEMENS ROM. *Epis. Prim. ad Corinth.* cap. 29. Comp. 1 Tim. ii. 8. Ibid. cap. 54. Comp. 1 Tim. iii. 13. In POLYCARP, *Ad Philipp.* c. 12. Comp. 1 Tim. ii. 12. Ibid. c. 4. Comp. 1 Tim. vi. 7, 10. In the letter to Diognetus (JUST. *Opera*, p. 501). Comp. 1 Tim. iii. 16. In IRENÆUS, *Adv. Hæres.* i. c. 1. Comp. 1 Tim. i. 4. In THEOPHYLUS, *Ad Autol.* c. 3. Comp. 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2. In CLEMENS ALEX. *Strom.* lib. 2. Comp. 1 Tim. vi. 20, 21. Lib. 2. Comp. 1 Tim. v. 14, 15. *Admonit. ad Gent.* p. 55. Comp. 1 Tim. iv. 7, 8. In TERTULLIAN, *de præscript. hæret.*, c. 25. Comp. 1 Tim. vi. 20; *De Pudicit.* c. 13. Comp. 1 Tim. i. 20.

The Second Epistle to Timothy is quoted by BARNABAS, *Epist.* c. 7. Comp. 2 Tim. iv. 1. By IGNATIUS, *Ad Ephes.* c. 2; and *Ad Smyrn.* c. 9, 10. Compare 2 Tim. i. 16, 18. By POLYCARP, *Ad Philipp.* c. 5. Compare 2 Tim. ii. 11, 12. By IRENÆUS, *Adv. Hæres.* v. c. 20. Comp. 2 Tim. iii. 7. By CLEMENS ALEX. *Strom.* lib. i. p. 270. Comp. 2 Tim. ii. 1, 2, 15. *Admonit. ad Gent.* p. 56. Comp. 2 Tim. iii. 15. TERTULLIAN, *Scorpiac.* c. 13. Comp. 2 Tim. iv. 6, 8. By EUSEBIUS, *H. E.* ii. 22. Comp. 2 Tim. iv. 17.

The Epistle to Titus, finally, by CLEMENS ROM. *Epist. prim. ad Corinth*, c. 2. Comp. Tit. iii. 1. By IGNATIUS, *Ad Trall.* c. 3. Comp. Titus ii. 3. By IRENÆUS, *Adv. Hæres.* iii. c. 3, § 4. Comp. Titus iii. 10, 11. Ibid. i. 16, 3. Comp. Titus iii. 10. By THEOPHYLUS, *Ad Autol.* i. 2, p. 95. Comp. Titus iii. 5, 6. By CLEMENS ALEX. *Strom.* lib. i. p. 299. Comp. Titus i. 12. *Adm. ad Gent.* p. 6. Comp. Titus ii. 11–13. By TERTULLIAN, *De præscript. Hæret.* c. 6. Comp. Titus iii. 10, 11.

If now we add, that EUSEBIUS without any question reckons the three Pastoral Epistles together among the *homologoumena;* that they appear in the Peschito as well as in the canon of Muratori; and that their rejection by the earlier Gnostic heretics can be explained from their partly polemic character, we must fully grant that the external evidences are entirely sufficient, and that JEROME was right, when in his preface to the Epist. to Tit., he declares in regard to the heretics who rejected these Epistles among others: "*Et si quidem redderent causas, cur eas Apostoli non putarent, tentaremus aliquid respondere et forsitan satisfacere lectori. Nunc vero cum hæretica auctoritate pronuncient et dicant: 'illa epistola Pauli est, hæc non est,' ea auctoritate refelli se pro veritate intelligant, quâ ipsi non erubescunt falsa simulare.*" Since the time of TATIAN, the genuineness of these writings has remained undisputed to the beginning of the present century. It is now, however, chiefly on internal grounds that objections are brought forward against these Epistles, especially against the first to Timothy. J. E. C. SCHMIDT, and particularly SCHLEIERMACHER, in 1807 opened the series, and were answered by PLANCK, WEGSCHEIDER and BECKHAUS. Soon after, EICHHORN directed his weapons against the three Epistles, and was sustained by DE WETTE, SCHOTT and SCHRADER, whilst even NEANDER and USTERI expressed themselves in doubtful tone as to the genuineness of the First Epistle. CREDNER in his introduction to the New Testament, p. 478, gave to the context a peculiar turn, since he ascribed the three Epistles, at first only in part but later as a whole, to a fictitious source. Next, on the other side, HUG, BERTHOLDT, FEILMOSER, GUERICKE, BÖHL, CURTIUS, KLING, HEYDENREICH, MACK and others appeared as defenders. But the Pastoral Letters re-

ceived their worst attack from the side of the newer TÜBINGEN school. F. C. BAUR in 1835 assaulted them with a strong hand, but soon found in BAUMGARTEN and BÖTTGER well-armed opponents, while MATTHIES, WIESINGER, DIETLEIN, THIERSCH and HUTHER wrote in favor of their genuineness. J. P. LANGE, in his *History of the Apostolic Age*, i. p. 84, and SCHAFF *Hist. of the Apost. Church*, § 87, also defended them. Among the most recent critics, who in spite of such strong apologetic works have given a judgment partly unfavorable, partly uncertain, are RUDOW, MANGOLD and REUSS. The latest contribution to the history and literature of this question may be found among others in HUTHER in his Commentary, second edition, p. 40 et seq. The external evidences for the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles are very thoroughly given by C. W. OTTO in his later work, p. 375 et seq.; where it is shown conclusively that the external evidences not only prove nothing against the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles, but rather confirm them in a striking manner, so far as is possible from the character of church literature in the first century after the apostolic time.

It will hardly need any apology, if we here speak at the same time of the genuinenss of the three Pastoral Epistles. According to BAUR's own admission (*Paulus*, p. 499), there is such a homogeneity in the three Epistles, that neither can be separated from the other two, and hence we may justly infer the identity of authorship.

As to all the internal objections, of which we must speak, they are partly of a philological, partly of a chronological, partly of a historical nature. A brief word on each of these three chief points of criticism.

The first objection concerns the peculiarities in the language of these Epistles, which are seen by comparison with other unquestionably genuine letters of St. Paul. There are reckoned in the first Epistle to Timothy eighty-one ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, in the second sixty-three; in the Epistle to Titus forty-four, of which some are found only in the later Church writers. Yet it is to be noted in regard to these (1) that even in other epistles of Paul there occur phrases, which are not found in him elsewhere; *e. g.* in Epistle to Philippians fifty-four, and in Epistles to Ephesians and Colossians together, more than one hundred and forty. (2) That the peculiar character of the objects, here named, makes the use of new words and forms of speech partly necessary, and partly very explainable. (3) That these Epistles, as will be later shown, belong to the last period in the life of the Apostle, when his style had reached its fullest capacity. (4) That in a pastoral letter to his special friends and scholars, quite another style would be admissible, than in an official, apostolic writing to the whole Church. (5) That every author has the liberty to say the same things in a very different manner; and that he will make use of this freedom so much the more, as his style becomes subjective and his personality more fully developed. (6) That the Holy Spirit wrought in regard to the speech of the apostles, in the truest sense with a progressive power of creation and life. (7) That the Apostle often reverts to the glowing and sharp language of his opponents, which he combats in these Epistles, so that many expressions, now seemingly foreign, are borrowed, perhaps, from the *ipsissima verba* of those errorists. (8) That not a few words and conceptions, held to be un-Pauline, are found in other unquestionably genuine Epistles of Paul; and that a forger, writing in the name of an apostle, would certainly have taken double care to exclude anomalies of such a sort from his fictitious work.

The second objection regards the fact, that in these Epistles, many points are referred to and discussed, which point to a later than the apostolic time. Of this sort, especially, is the description of the heretics here named; the constitution of the Church here anticipated as if present; that which the Apostle says in the first Epistle to Timothy in regard to widows, etc. It must be remembered in respect to this: (1) that the identity of these heretics with the Gnostics of the second century is not at all made out as yet; and even the opposite is provable from other apostolic letters, that at least the seeds of their errors were already scattered in the time of Paul, and had partly sprung up. The grounds on which BAUR, for instance, has supposed that he could find a reference here to the Marcionites, are arbitrary and weak in the extreme. The heresy here opposed is no other than that which the Apostle examines, among others, in the

Epistle to the Colossians; and it is *a priori* probable that the errorists, who appear with so much strength in the second century, did not suddenly shoot up as if out of the ground, but rather had their πρόδρομοι already in the earlier period. Warnings against such earlier errors as we meet in the first Epistle to Timothy, would no longer be necessary in the second century, when the Churchly and the Gnostic ideas had already reached a period of absolute division. (2) It must, undoubtedly, be granted, that in these Epistles there is fuller mention of churchly institutions and organization than in the other writings of the Apostle. But it is clear, meanwhile, from the Book of the Acts (chap. vi. 1), that the diaconate was already very early established; and that Paul had been wont to appoint bishops almost everywhere, is clear also from the Acts (xiv. 23; xx. 17). Now it lies in the nature of things, that definite rules were necessary for the fulfilment of these offices, and, therefore, that such rules could have no better place than in these Epistles to Timothy and Titus. The hierarchical tendencies which have been here discovered, lie solely in the imagination of critics, as will appear plain at once, if we even superficially compare the Pastoral Letters with the letters of Ignatius. Of the later episcopal order no trace is here discoverable; the πρεσβύτεροι and ἐπίσκοποι are in no way as yet separated from each other; they are rather identical; the diaconate is not once mentioned in the Epistle to Titus, and the rules for the office of a bishop are given with the utmost simplicity and brevity. If Paul knew and weighed the significance of Church organization for the welfare of the Christian body, which can hardly indeed be doubted, then it is altogether consistent that at the close of his life, before he left the scene of his earthly action, he should express himself more fully on the subject; and with his knowledge of the many dangers threatening the community, this care for its overseers would lie more earnestly on his heart. It has been said, indeed, that Paul did not in general give the slightest weight to Church institutions; but the proofs of this remain, in our view, quite wanting. And (3) last of all, as to the regulation in regard to widows (1 Tim. v. 3–14). It might, perhaps, appear that the Epistle belongs to a period, when the name χήρα was given to all in the community who continued unmarried for the Lord's sake; yet no proof whatever has been offered us by Baur that the word widow must here be understood in this wider sense. No παρθένοι are here meant, but real widows; and the rule given them can in no case be called a law for a distinct, ascetic mode of life. On the question whether we are to understand by these widows actual deaconesses, we shall speak further in this Commentary. That Christian widows had received a place of honor in the community, and already in the day of Paul had consecrated themselves wholly to such a life-service, cannot, in itself, be held at all improbable. Of still less weight are other internal doubts, which have been offered against the Pauline origin of the Pastoral Epistles. The apparent agreement seen in all the three is sufficiently explained from the fact, that in the same period of the Apostle's life they are directed to two men, whose position and wants were in many points alike. That Timothy is treated as an inferior, and addressed in the tone of a schoolmaster, has only a show of truth, when we linger on the sound of the words, without looking at the heart of the writer, and taking into account his consciousness of high apostolic authority. Not only here, but also in other letters of the Apostle, a peculiar prominence is given to pure doctrine against rising errors; and thus, too, the Christology of these Epistles is the same as, *e. g.*, in the Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians, as will appear from the exposition of some striking passages. The want of logical connection in the conceptions and ideas, so peculiar to our Apostle elsewhere, but here far less apparent, is not really so striking as has been represented; it is partly the result of the practical and pastoral tenor of the Epistle, and partly, again, due to the relative advance in the age of the author. The predominant ethical view of life, the constantly repeated call to good works, etc., is nowise in irreconcilable strife with the Pauline doctrine of grace; but finds many echoes in other writings with which the Pastoral Epistles here and there agree so strikingly, that a new proof of forgery has been seen in this very circumstance. Why should not Paul, however, in handling the same subjects, find a necessity now and then for the same phrases? That beside these special instances, there are abundant traces of likeness in spirit, tone and drift to the other, genuine Epistles, becomes more palpably clear with each new comparison.

The chronological objection remains, then, the chief one. In the history of Paul as known to us, no point can be named, which we can exactly receive as the date of the authorship; in which view, therefore, we cannot conceive how these Epistles could have been written in very near succession. We acknowledge in so far these difficulties, that we hold the composition of these letters *before* or during the *first* imprisonment of Paul at Rome to be in the highest degree improbable, not to say impossible; and we must regard as useless the various attempts to bring one of these Epistles into the life of the Apostle, as known to us in the Book of the Acts. But the question is, whether we should not admit a second imprisonment of Paul at Rome; and in that case we should place these letters in the time of his life just preceding his martyrdom. We believe, for our part, that we must give an affirmative answer to this question; nay, we find in the Pastoral Epistles themselves the strongest proof, that the church tradition of a second imprisonment of the Apostle at Rome is in the main well-grounded.

In the Epistles which Paul writes in his first imprisonment, there is seen throughout the expectation, that notwithstanding his desire to depart and to be with Christ, he shall be freed and restored to the community (Phil. i. 25, 26; ii. 24; Philem. xxii). In his second letter to Timothy, on the contrary, he speaks of the sure prospect of his soon approaching martyrdom; and we learn that at his first answer all men forsook him (2 Tim. iv. 16). It is alike improbable, either that the first named hope of the Apostle remained unfulfilled, or that the last named statement refers to his first imprisonment. His release from the first captivity is by no means incredible; but rather it may be easily explained by the favorable feeling which was personally excited in many toward him (Phil. i. 12, 13; conf. Acts xxiv. 23–27; xxvi. 28–32). No wonder, therefore, that the church tradition quite early favored the view of a second imprisonment, during which the second Epistle to Timothy might have been written. EUSEBIUS, H. E. ii. 22, speaks of it in the phrase: λόγος ἔχει, by which he did not at all mean a wavering or doubtful legend, merely of sporadic growth, but a general, prevalent conviction, a tradition, which he repeats as such. The view, which thus generally obtained in his time, that the Apostle was really freed from his first imprisonment, rested on the witness of older writers, whom EUSEBIUS does not indeed cite by name, but whom he probably had known. The classic passage in this connection from CLEM. ROM. *Epist. prim. ad Corinth*, c. 5, has at least in our view a decisive weight here. It reads thus: "Παῦλος — *κήρυξ γενόμενος ἔν τε τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει, τὸν γενναῖον τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ κλέος ἔλαβεν δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθὼν καὶ μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων, οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ κόσμου καὶ εἰς τὸν τόπον ἅγιον ἐπορεύθη.*"* If now this sentence, e. g. in the words *ὅλον τὸν κόσμον*, may bear a rhetorical stamp, still it is by no means to be thence inferred, that the plain declaration contained in it may be wrong. Although Paul was not in the literal sense of the word a herald of Christ through the whole world, yet the distinct assurance of CLEMENT that he preached in the west as well as the east, has its full weight. The limit in the west which Paul reached, according to his own account, cannot be Rome, but rather Spain (conf. Rom. xv. 28). The supposition that a Roman, who wrote this, should have represented Italy as his utmost limit, is as arbitrary as the notion that we are to think of a purely *subjective* limit here, which the Apostle had sketched for himself, in which case the pronoun *ἑαυτοῦ* could not possibly have been omitted. That Paul in fact had fulfilled his plan of journeying to Spain, which could only have happened after his release from the first imprisonment, is inferred not merely from the tradition descending from the fourth century, but also from the well-known fragment from the canon in Muratori, written in the second half of the second century, in which the journey of the Apostle is given as a historic fact, in the words: *profectionem Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis.*† The early conjunction of the martyrdom of Peter and Paul in the church tradition has here also a certain significance, since it cannot be admitted, that Peter came to

* A proof so much the less questionable, in that CLEMENT probably had personally known the Apostle, whose disciple he perhaps was (Phil. iv. 3); and that he lived in Rome, where they would have preserved an exact knowledge of the last fortunes of Paul (RUFFET).

† WIESELER is purely arbitrary. "Such opinions as seem indicated in the canon of Muratori, which may have been held by this or that individual, although they have not reached us from the original sources, may have been the meaning of EUSEBIUS in his λόγος ἔχει."

Rome during the first imprisonment of Paul (Acts xxviii. 30, 31): and either he could not have suffered death with him, or it must have been at a later time. The rise of this tradition of a second imprisonment cannot be satisfactorily explained, if this lacks historic ground. We have, for the rest, as little occasion here to inquire whether the actual presence of Paul in Spain can be affirmed, as to give a connected picture of the life and doings of the Apostle in this last period of his career. Enough, that even apart from the Second Epistle to Timothy, the tradition of a second imprisonment deserves credit on external and internal grounds, as it has been in every time defended by powerful and eloquent voices: e. g. by PALEY, *Horæ Paulinæ, ad h. l.*, an author, who even now may claim to be consulted in our contest with the latest destructive criticism. If his treatment of the evidence be just, then there is a whole period in the life of Paul, in which we can place the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles; so that the chronological objection to their genuineness is as little beyond confutation, as the philological and historical. Comp. G. ASTRO, *Spec. Exeg. Histor.. de alt. Pauli Captivitate*, Tr. ad Rh. 1859. M. RUFFET, *la double Captivité de St. Paul à Rome*, Paris, 1860. We may further compare the Special Introductions and Exegetical comments which follow, and the article "Paulus" in HERZOG's *Real-Encyclopädie.*

[Among the more recent English expositors, ALFORD, ELLICOTT, CONYBEARE, HOWSON and WORDSWORTH, maintain the ground of St. Paul's release from his first imprisonment. V. ALFORD *in loco* for a thorough summary of the evidence. The argument for one imprisonment is well stated by DAVIDSON, *Introd. to the N. T.*—TR.]

§ 3. IMPORTANCE.

The value of the Pastoral Epistles is beyond all doubt. They belong to the most precious memorials of the Apostolic time, which have come to our knowledge. They give us new aids toward a right judgment of the character of the great Apostle to the Gentiles, and his relation to his friends and co-laborers; toward the nearer knowledge of the earliest polity of the Christian church, and of the errors so soon arising within its pale. Thus they serve as invaluable material for biblical biography and the oldest church history. They contain, besides, a choice collection of counsels and warnings for the teachers and guides of the church, which remain always important through all centuries. Criticism has said, that the directions of St. Paul to Timothy are too vague and insignificant to be worthy of him; but it has not given sufficient weight to the fact, that it was not so much the Apostle's design to establish the legislation of the church, as to lay down in his writing the high principles and weighty rules, which should remain unforgotten by the shepherds of the flock. CALVIN is right in so far, when he writes of the Second Epistle to Timothy: "*In his duabus epistolis quasi in vivâ tabulâ depictum habemus verum ecclesiæ regimen.*" Undoubtedly we should go too far in our estimate of these writings, if we considered them as a complete pastoral charge, or a full compendium of pastoral theology. They have neither that thorough order, nor that completeness, nor that universal application in all the rules here given, which would be demanded for such a purpose.* Much has exclusive reference to circumstances of person and place; much is likewise directed to the wants not only of the chief minister but of the community itself; as to which CALVIN notices, that these Epistles do not bear exclusively the character of a confidential private writing. "*Hanc epistolam aliorum magisquam Timothei causa scriptum esse judico,*" thus begins his exposition of the argument on the First Epistle to Timothy,—"*et mihi assentientur, qui diligenter omnia expenderint. Non equidem nego, quin ejus quoque docendi et monendi rationem Paulus habuerit, sed multa hic contineri dico, quæ supervacuum fuisset scribere, si cum solo Timotheo habuisset negotium.*" But however this may be, the Pastoral Epistles certainly deserve to be the *vade mecum* of each present or future religious teacher, who will find embodied here a rich treasure of doctrine and counsel, of comfort and encouragement. Especially in days like ours, when so many questions in reference to church organization are

* [It should be noted here, as the true canon of criticism, that St. Paul does not give in these letters the formal constitution, according to which the church is to be built; but he is writing of an already existing reality. The theory does not precede the fact; but the fact precedes the theory, which explains it.—TR.]

asked with new energy, the weighty precepts of the Pastoral Letters deserve to be expounded with all earnestness. Where they hold before our eyes a speaking picture of the simplicity of the Apostolic age, they belong to the whole work of Protestantism against the usurpations of the Papal hierarchy. The heretics here opposed and unmasked are and remain in many regards the types of later false teachers; the warnings against 'oppositions of science, falsely so called,' which were needful for Timothy, are no less so in our day against so many, who have learned nothing and forgotten nothing. Here, too, as it were in passing, there is given a strong witness to many a cardinal truth of the Gospel, so that these brief writings are relatively rich in *loci classici* for the doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture, the Divinity of Christ, the work of atonement, and the new birth through the Holy Ghost, &c., as will be shown in various places and passages. That furthermore Christian ethics finds here manifold warnings against certain sins, and encouragements to certain Christian graces, is self-evident at the first glance. Thus the contents of the Pastoral Epistles justify the honorable place which they hold among the canonical writings of the New Testament, and prove themselves also the fruit of the Holy Ghost, who influenced the Apostle in no mechanical manner when he took his stylus in his hand, as if he were one of the *actuarii* and *notarii* of the Spirit; but inspired him so fully even in writing, that he was enabled clearly to develop the Christian truth, to exhibit the Christian life in a living way, and to give the pastor and teacher suggestions regarding its normal principles, worthy to the end of time of the earnest reflection of all ministers of the Gospel. We can thus with good conscience repeat, in reference to all three Epistles, the praise given by STARKE: "This Epistle is surely a rich treasure of truth, since in words, seemingly at first so simple, there lie such depths, that a preacher will only truly grasp them after much experience of their large spirit and high wisdom; and will still find enough remaining always for his study,"—nay, with good reason he adds, "that in this Epistle there is contained a true house-tablet for all estates of men." Thus, too, the directin of the Saxon church canon was a just one: "that a minister of the church should most diligently read the Epistles of Paul to Timothy and Titus; and read again and often repeat, that he might learn how to maintain himself both in love and life, and how to rule his own household and himself." HUTHER: "The weighty question: πῶς δεῖ ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ ἀναστρέφεσθαι has here an answer, harmonious in spirit with what is expressed in all the other letters of Paul. Might the question never have been answered, and never be answered in any other spirit in the church!"

§ 4. THEOLOGICAL-HOMILETICAL TREATMENT OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

It is not necessary to our design to give a complete view of the literary history of these Epistles. A rich collection of writings on the general subject, or on particular chapters and verses, will be found among others, in WINER, *Handbuch d. Theol. Literatur.* I. p. 265; and in J. A. J. WEISINGER, in his *Commentary*, Königsberg, 1851, p. 257. We shall name only those writings whose study and use is desirable for practical divines and pastors. Among the Reformers LUTHER must especially be named. *Scholia et Sermones in Prim. Joh. Epist. atque Annott. in Pauli Epist. (priorem ad Timoth. et Titum*, edit. Bruns. Lübeck, 1797. Then the Commentary of CALVIN; that on both Epistles to Timothy, dedicated to Edward, Duke of Somerset; that on the Epistle to Titus, to his co-workers, FAREL and VIRET, whose labor he had received and carried forward at Geneva in somewhat such manner as Titus the work of Paul at Crete. Also MELANCHTHON: *Enarratio Epistolæ prim. ad Timoth. et duorum Capitum secundæ*, Wittemberg, 1561. Among later authors, who have labored in the spirit of the Reformation, BENGEL must least of all be forgotten. His *Gnomon* contains precious material for the right understanding of the Pastoral Letters. Not to cite among the expositors those whose labor has become more or less antiquated from the present standpoint of science, we mention only the exegetical works which we wish to see especially in the hands of the clergy, who would prepare themselves by independent study for preaching or Bible instruction. Beside the Commentary of WIESINGER already named, which appeared as the continuation of OLSHAUSEN's Commentary, and contains likewise the Epistles to the Philippians and Philemon, we ought

specially to mention the thorough exposition of the Pastoral Epistles, with particular reference to the authenticity, place and time of authorship, by Dr. C. S. MATTHIES, Greifswald, 1840, which has made the earlier works of PLATT, MACK, HEYDENREICH, and others quite superfluous Further, the brief exposition of the Epistles to Titus, Timothy, and Hebrews, by Dr. W. M. L DE WETTE, 2d ed. 1847; but before all others the noble critical-exegetical treatise on the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, prepared by Dr. J. E. HUTHER, 2d enlarged ed., Götting., 1859, 11th part of MEYER's *Comment. on the N. T.** Among the writings which have appeared beyond Germany, and which specially claim to be consulted in regard to St. Paul and these Epistles, we name Mr. J. DA COSTA; *Paulus, eene Schriftbeschouwing.* 2 Th. Leyden, 1846–47. Dr. H. E. VINKE: *De Zend brieven van den Ap. Paulus aan Timoth. Titus en Philemon, met oppelderende en toe passelyke Aanmerkingen.* Utrecht, 1859. AD. MONOD; *St. Paul, cinq discours.* Paris, 1851. CONYBEARE AND HOWSON: *Life and Letters of St. Paul.* London, 1850–53. 2 parts, in 4to; admirable both in form and contents [republished by C. Scribner, New York]. From the Danish there has appeared in a translation (Jena, 1846), an excellent work of Dr. C. E. SCHARLING. The latest essays on these Epistles, both for their exposition and their relation to Biblical Criticism and the Canon. Among English introductory works which have been devoted to the Pastoral Epistles, we must specially name *Th. H. Horne*, an Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, 3d ed., revised by S. T. TREGELLES. Lond., 1862, pp. 547–560. Finally may be compared the latest writers on the Apostolic age: NEANDER, SCHAFF, THIERSCH, LANGE, and others. WIESELER, *Chronol. des Apost. Zeitalters*, Göttingen, 1848; although he admits no second imprisonment of Paul at Rome. LECHLER: *Das apost. und nach-apost. Zeitalter.* 2d Aufl. 1857. We name also, J. DIEDRICH: *Die Briefe St. Pauli an Timotheus, Titus, Philemon und der Brief an die Hebräer, Kurz erklärt für heilsbegierige aufmerksame Bibelleser;* but especially copious, and rich in learning, the work of Dr. C. W. OTTO (which appeared after the preparation of this part of our Bible work); *The Historical Relations of the Pastoral Epistles anew Examined*, Leipzig, 1860; with which should be compared also a thorough recension by WEISSE in the *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1861. III. In a peculiar way the genuineness of the Epistles has been defended by Prof. MÄRCKER in a short but interesting essay on the position of the Pastoral Letters in the life of St. Paul, although he allows only one imprisonment. Meiningen, 1861. The Commentary of HUTHER furnishes powerful weapons for the strife against the hypercritical views of the Tübingen school. As to exegetical or practical aids for the study and use of particular parts of the Pastoral Epistles, we shall speak in the proper place.

[It is unnecessary, in adding the more important English works connected with these Epistles, to give more than a passing notice of older expositors, as HAMMOND, WHITBY, BENSON, MACKNIGHT, NEWCOME, and BLOOMFIELD in his Greek Testament. They are learned and judicious; but at this day of less worth, as they do not fully meet the more difficult questions since raised as to the genuineness of these Epistles; and the later historic criticism has thrown new light on some special topics, *e. g.* the early heresies, and the order of deaconess. The *Horæ Paulinæ* of PALEY, however, deserves to be always remembered, as one of the earliest and most ingenious essays in that comparative history of the Acts and the Epistles, which has since been so largely explored. The more recent exegetical works have added much to our knowledge of this part of the New Testament. Among them, that of CONYBEARE and HOWSON: *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 7th American ed. 1866, is the richest contribution to the history and literature of the Apostle's age. ALFORD has given a thorough criticism of the Pastoral Epistles, in his *Greek Test. with Notes.* See especially his *Prolegomena* for a discussion of the evidences of their genuineness. CHR. WORDSWORTH: *Greek Test. with Introd. and Notes*, London, 1866, is of chief value for his large citations from Patristic history and theology in regard to the Pauline time. ELLICOTT: *Comment. Epp. to Tim.*, is worthy of careful study. DAVIDSON: *Introd. N. T.*, is the ablest English writer who has defended the theory of one imprisonment. In addition to these, much valuable matter concerning the life of St. Paul may be found in LARDNER: *Hist. Apost. and Evang.* SMITH: *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul.* TATE: *Continuous History of St. Paul.* LEWIN: *St. Paul.*—TR.]

* [It is to be hoped that the admirable Commentary of MEYER, as yet the best in any language for critical ability will before long be translated for the use of English and American readers.—TR.]

THE

FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1.

Timothy, to whom two of the Pastoral Epistles are addressed, was from Lycaonia, or according to some, from Lystra (Acts xvi. 1), according to others, from Derbe (Acts xx. 4). The son of a Jewish mother, Eunice, and a Greek father, he had from the former, as also from his grandmother, Lois, a devout training and instruction in the Old Testament Scriptures (2 Tim. i. 5; iii. 14, 15). That he was a relative of St. Paul (*Origen*) is as unproved, as the supposition (*Starke*) that his father belonged to the σεβομένοι, the proselytes of the gate. In this family the Word of the Lord (Matt. x. 34–36) was truth; for while the father remained an unbeliever, the mother and son were already converts to Christianity before the second missionary journey of Paul, who became acquainted with them at Lystra. The Apostle found the youthful Timothy ready and willing to accompany him on his farther journey, as he had a good report with the brethren (Acts xvi. 1, 2). From the fact that the Apostle calls him his son (τέκνον, 1 Cor. iv. 17), we may justly infer, that he had received the Gospel through the preaching of Paul, at his first sojourn in Lystra (Acts xiv. 6, 7). Out of consideration for the Jews he circumcised him, as his father was a Greek, and then took him into the chosen companionship of his confidential friends and followers (Acts xix. 22). He journeys with the Apostle over Troas to Philippi, Thessalonica, and Berea, where he first remains, to follow Paul later to Athens (Acts xvii. 14, 15). Not long after he was sent by the Apostle to Thessalonica, to strengthen and comfort that young community (1 Thess. iii. 1–5), and to join Paul again in Corinth (Acts xviii. 5; 1 Thess. iii. 6). Where Timothy had lived in the time between the second and third missionary journey of Paul, the history does not tell us, but we find him again on the third missionary journey at Ephesus by the side of the great Apostle to the Gentiles (Acts xix. 22), from whence he entrusts to him a message to Macedonia and Achaia (1 Cor. iv. 17; xvi. 10, 11). When Paul wrote his second letter from Macedonia to the Corinthians, Timothy was by him (2 Cor. i. 1), and accompanied him soon after on a journey to Corinth, from whence also his greeting was borne to the community at Rome (Rom. xvi. 21). On the Apostle's return through Macedonia, he sent Timothy, among others, beforehand to Troas (Acts xx. 4). Still later we meet him again at Rome; at the time of the Apostle's first imprisonment, in his close neighborhood (v. the beginning of the Epistles to Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon). From thence Paul was minded to send him as soon as possible to Philippi, to learn the condition of the community there (Phil. ii. 19), of which design, however, it does not appear later that there was an actual fulfilment. As we infer from our Epistle, the Apostle, after his release from his first captivity, had left him behind in Ephesus on a journey to Macedonia (1 Tim. i. 3), and hoped soon to meet him there again (1 Tim. iii. 13). Probably on this occasion (not at the outset of the journey, Acts xvi.) he was consecrated by solemn laying on

of hands to the work of the ministry (1 Tim. i. 18; iv. 14), so that the tradition is mainly right which makes him the first Bishop of the Church at Ephesus, although we do not explain this title in the later hierarchical sense. Probably he had labored there for some time, until an urgent letter of Paul, during his second imprisonment, called him very speedily to Rome (2 Tim. iv. 21). When and where he was cast into prison, from which he was again released according to Heb. xiii. 23, can only be inferred by conjecture. Tradition says, that he suffered martyrdom under the Emperor Domitian (81–96 A. D. NICEPHOR. iii. 11); but according to BARONIUS, it was under Trajan, A. D. 109. Of his personal Christian character, all which we know with certainty or can fairly infer, gives the most favorable witness; and it is wholly without ground that any have questioned this from the admonitions which the aged Apostle thought needful in view of his youth. In the fullest sense of the word he deserves the honorable name "man of God," which the Apostle gives him (1 Tim. vi. 11), and he must stand still higher in our eyes, if we look more closely at the difficult circumstances with which he had more and more to contend at Ephesus. His connection with Paul, so far as we learn from history, is from the outset unbroken, intimate, inexhaustibly happy for himself, yet for the Apostle also a source of refreshing and comfort in his trials. Not only does he appear in this equal to the other co-workers and friends of Paul, but it is recorded that he surpassed them all (Phil. ii. 20); which doubtless was partly due to the admirable training given by his mother. NIEMEYER, in his Characteristics of the Bible, I. p. 442, says truly in his praise: "The Apostolic history tells us how closely he always walked in the counsels of his teacher, how diligent to spread the gospel, how he renounced all, even harmless comfort, that he might not throw the least stumbling-block in the way of Christianity (1 Tim. v. 23). That noble feeling, that heart wholly given to God and Christ, binds him so fast to Paul, that he cannot speak of him save in the tenderest language; that he calls him his dear, upright son, and commends him with such warmth to the love of other communions. Hallowed indeed to us—hallowed peculiarly to all the teachers of religion, be the remembrance of the noble man, the earliest emulator of the great Apostle." The article on Timothy, by A. KÖHLER, in HERZOG'S *Real-Encyklopädie*, XVI. pp. 167–172, deserves here to be compared; and not less that by T. RANKE in PIPER'S *Evangel. Kalender*, 1850, pp. 70–74; as well as the *Biblische Wörterbuch für das Christliche Volk*. Stuttgart, 1857 *in voce*.

§ 2. TIME, PLACE, AND DESIGN OF THE COMPOSITION.

From the Epistle itself we can infer only what follows, as to the time when the Apostle first wrote to Timothy. According to Chap. i. 3, the Apostle was, when he wrote this letter, on the road from Ephesus to Macedonia; while he had left Timothy at the first-named place, and then was minded (chap. iii. 14) to return as soon as he could, although he thought a delay quite possible. We can almost definitely assume, that nothing is said in the Acts of this stay of the Apostle at Ephesus. For the first time he remains there only a very short season (Acts xviii. 19); the second time he had resided there indeed from two to three years, yet it is clear from various circumstances, that this journey from Ephesus to Macedonia (Acts xx. 1) cannot be the same the Apostle speaks of (1 Tim. i. 3). On this occasion Timothy is not left behind as Bishop of the Church at Ephesus; he has rather, according to Acts xx. 3, accompanied the Apostle, already three months later, on his further journey. Besides, Paul was not intending (Acts xx. 1) so soon to return to Ephesus as had been his design according to 1 Tim. iii. 14; on the contrary, he was on the way to Jerusalem; he did not remain at this time at Ephesus, nay, he expresses his foreboding that the elders of that community will see his face no more (Acts xx. 16, 25). We are hence compelled to infer another journey of Paul from Ephesus to Macedonia, and can fix it only after his release from his first imprisonment at Rome.* From the want of sufficiently sure historic data, we must be content with a certain measure of probability as to the question, how long after the release this letter was written. If we now suppose, that the

* MÄRCKER, a. a. O; p. 6, attempts to justify, but only by a forced method, his view that we are here to understand the journey, Acts xviii. 21, to Jerusalem. He explains, solely on internal grounds, the words, B. 31, εἰς Μακεδονίαν, as spurious. The complete impossibility of supposing this one of the journeys, of which we are told in the Acts, is well shown by RUFFÉT.

Apostle was early informed of the appearance and growth of erroneous teachers in Asia Minor and Ephesus at that time, then the probability is unavoidable, that very soon after his release from his chains he hastened thither, and from thence, after leaving Timothy, journeyed to Macedonia and Greece. If now we suppose (WIESELER) that the first imprisonment of Paul at Rome was during the years 61–63, then we are induced to place the composition of this letter at the end of the year 63, or the beginning of 64. The contents of the letter have nothing to prevent our supposing this comparatively early date.

Where Paul was at the writing of this first Epistle, cannot be precisely known. The designation of Athens as the place of composition in the *vers. Copt. et Erp.* lacks every historic ground; and it is equally so with the old subscription found in many manuscripts, as well as the Peschito, which gives *Phrygia Pacatiana.* This last supposition points to a later time, since before the age of Constantine the Great, there is no mention of *Phrygia Pacatiana.* If we might suppose that the first Epistle to Timothy was composed shortly after that to Titus, we might perhaps have thought of Nicopolis; but the internal probabilities lead us to give to this first letter to Timothy the priority among the Pastoral Epistles. Another hypothesis, that the letter was sent from Laodicea, would hardly have been received, had not some confounded it, groundlessly, with the ἐπιστολὴ ἐκ Λαοδικείας, to which Col. iv. 16 alludes (THEOPHYLACT). From the obscurity which hangs over this less important question, it is best to be content with the general suggestion, that the letter was probably composed in Macedonia, at least in its neighborhood. "The hypothesis that the letter was written in the prison at Cesarea, and contained a charge to Timothy for Macedonia, is too forced to deserve a more precise refutation." (DE WETTE).

The occasion and purport of this writing are clear enough from the contents. What the Apostle at his earlier departure from Ephesus (Acts xx. 29) had feared, he had only too soon realized.* Heretical teachers had arisen (chap. i. 4); and Timothy, still comparatively young, needed much this counsel and guidance for his action in such a case. We prefer to show later the proper character of these erroneous teachers, and to answer better, in our exposition of the letter itself, the question in what relation they stand to other like phenomena in the apostolic time, since we can then consider together their various features. Enough, that in their doctrine there were seen the ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως· (1 Tim. vi. 20), whose seeds already showed themselves in the days of Paul; and the Apostle considered the contradiction between their doctrine and practice on the one side, and his gospel on the other, as wholly irreconcilable. With so much greater eagerness he turns his eye toward Timothy, because he recalls his youth (chap. iv. 12). He must be warned partly against deviations in conduct, partly against despondency; and as his position in the church was by no means equal to that of the Apostle, he needed a public testimony to the agreement of his teaching with that of Paul. To this end, then, the Epistle was written, although his own position and that of the church was also kept in view. WIESELER says somewhat too strongly: "The whole composition of the letter presupposes a slight practice and experience of Timothy in the rule of the affairs of a Christian community." However, he was not as yet self-poised and spiritually ripe, and thus he was not only counselled here to hold fast to the confession and profession of the truth, but he was enlightened as to the weighty matters regarding the direction and guidance of the church. No further design for later times, undoubtedly, passed consciously through the mind of the Apostle; but he who believes that the Spirit of Truth guided his writing, and cared for the wants of the church in the coming ages also, will find here expressed not indeed the fixed forms, in which church polity and the organization of the Christian community must move from century to century in all lands, yet their great, unchangeable groundlaws. Thus LUTHER is right, when he says in his preface: "St. Paul writes this Epistle as a model for all Bishops, what they shall teach, and how they shall rule the Christian Church in all circumstances, so that they need not guide Christian men by their own human darkness."

* The supposition of Dr. OTTO, that the first Epistle to Timothy was written on account of the Corinthian troubles, is by no means favored by a deeper study of the Epistles to the Corinthians compared with the character of the heretical teachers here described.

§ 3. CONTENTS AND DIVISIONS OF THE EPISTLE.

For the purpose of a general view of the contents of this Epistle, it will be useful to give here its chief divisions, although their mutual connections can be better explained by the exposition itself. After the apostolic greeting, Paul at once (chap. i. 3) recalls the exhortation which he had left to Timothy, and gives a short account of the erroneous teachers whom he must above all oppose (v. 4). In relation to those who deceitfully present themselves as teachers of the law he now brings to view the true meaning of the law (vv. 5–10) in regard to which he expresses his personal gratitude for the mercy which had befallen him in his own conversion and calling to the service of the Gospel (vv. 11–17). Here he returns to his starting point (v. 8), and counsels Timothy to fight the good fight of faith as a soldier, while he recalls for his warning the sad example of two well-known heretics (vv. 19, 20). In the following verses he counsels the diligent use of public prayers, whilst he supports his counsel by many motives (chap. ii. 1–7), and then in particular shows, how both men and women should conduct themselves in this and in the social assemblies of the church (vv. 8–15). This opens the way (chap. iii.) for his special discourse on the appointment of bishops of the church (vv. 1–13). He shows what wants Timothy must particularly consider (vv. 1–8) in the selection of bishops and (vv. 9–13) of deacons; as to which he remarks that he expects soon to visit him, but writes this beforehand, that Timothy may know how he is to act in the church of God (vv. 14, 15). Here follows a passage on the great mystery of godliness (v. 16), which better agrees with the connections of the fourth chapter, and leads the Apostle to show in its true light the truth preached by him, in contrast to the errors he opposes (chap. iv. 1–5). The Apostle refers to the prophets, who predicted the times of apostasy, in which dangerous errors should go hand in hand with immoral precepts; but again he passes on (vv. 6–16) in a tone of paternal anxiety, to give Timothy various admonitions as to the exercise of his official duty. In the fifth chapter he proceeds to write rules of conduct for different classes in the Christian body. Sometimes more briefly, sometimes more fully, Paul points out here, how he should act toward the old and the young (vv. 1, 2), toward widows in regard to their support by the community (vv. 3–8); further, what rules he should adopt in his choice of deaconesses, and what should be his counsel as to the young widows (vv. 9–16). In regard to the elders he gives many observations, partly how the church (vv. 17, 18), partly how Timothy himself must act in various conditions and circumstances (vv. 19–22); in which he offers a wholesome rule for his own health (v. 23), and he adds a general counsel, rich in the knowledge of human nature (vv. 24, 25), which shall make him cautious in judgment of others. In the last chapter his advice is directed partly to the church, in reference to different classes. He informs servants how they must conduct themselves toward unbelieving as well as believing masters (vv. 1, 2), while immediately after follows a strong rebuke to those who, from impure motives, preach another doctrine than that of the Apostle (vv. 3–5). In view of their insatiable covetousness, the Apostle shows the indivisible connection of godliness and contentment, and warns against the love of money, which is not only for the individual, but the church, the root of many evils (vv. 6–10). In opposition to this bad state of things, Timothy must remain true to his high calling (vv. 11–16) and fight the good fight of faith, remembering his own good confession, and that of his suffering Saviour, as well as his hope of the glorious appearing of Christ. Here, perhaps, the Epistle would fitly close; yet the thought of the richer members of the community draws out a special warning from the Apostle's heart (vv. 17, 18), whilst his love of Timothy compels him once more to gather all his counsels in a strong, closing exhortation, which he then seals with his benediction (vv. 19–21).

From this summary sketch, it appears that there is to be found here no systematic order of thought, as, *e. g.* in the Epistles to the Romans and Ephesians, but a free, natural outpouring of the Apostle's heart. It is impossible to show any organic connection, but rather the varied counsels of this letter remind us of pearls of varied color and size, yet strung on one thread. The spirit remains one and the same in all these exhortations, so that the remark of our old STARKE is just: "The style is plain, simple, and artless, yet pointed and impressive, as a father

is wont to write to his son, caring more for the quality of the things than the nicety of the words. Yet there shines everywhere a lofty spirit and a great truth, which a teacher, the oftener he rightly reads and reflects on, discovers more and more."

§ 4. LITERATURE.

Beside the authors already named in the first General Introduction, we may compare Witsius: *de vitâ Timothei breviarium*, in the *Miscellanea Sacra*, II. Herborn, 1712, 2d ed. p. 557 *et seq.* T. A. Wegscheider: *The First Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy, newly translated and expounded*, 1810. G. E. Leo: *Epist. prim. ad Timoth. Græce cum comment. perpetuo*, 1837. J. Berriman: *Θεὸς ἐφανερ. ἐν σαρκί*, or, *Critic. Dissertat. on* 1 *Tim.* iii. 16. London, 1741. J. G. Burkhardt: *Dissert. Theol. Inaug. de loco* 1 *Tim.* iii. 16. Lips., 1786. *The Treatise on this Epistle, in the New Testament* by O. v. Gerlach. Dr. H. L. Heubner: *Practical Exposition of the New Test.*, 4 vols. Potsdam, 1859, containing both Epistles to Timothy; and others. [In addition to the English expository works named in the General Introduction, we may refer to a few which should be consulted in regard to the special topics of the first Epistle. The history of the heresies in St. Paul's time is handled with much ingenuity by Stanley: *Comm. on Ep. Corinth.*, whose theory, however partial as to the Gnostic traces in other parts of the New Testament, has strong confirmation in the Pastoral Epistles. We should name especially also Schaff's *Apostol. Church*, B. IV. ch. 3. This work, although of German authorship, stands foremost in learning and ability among all which have been written in our own language. Burton: *Lectures*, has given much light on the Jewish origin of these heresies. See also, for some striking observations, the late commentary of T. L. Davies: *Epp. to Ephesians, Colossians* and *Philemon.* London, 1866. In regard to the primitive rule of deaconess, v. Howson · *Deaconesses*, London, 1862, and the admirable volume of J. M. Ludlow: *Woman's Work in the Church*, London, 1866. The vexed question of Episcopacy and Presbytery, as connected with these Epistles, has employed many writers in the English Church; but as they are of more ecclesiastical than exegetical value, they are not here mentioned.—Tr.]

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO

TIMOTHY.*

I.

Superscription, and wish for Blessing.

CH. I. 1, 2.

1 Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ [Christ Jesus][1] by [according to] the commandment[2] of God our Saviour,[3] and Lord Jesus Christ,[4] *which is* our hope;
2 Unto Timothy, *my* own son in the faith: Grace, mercy, *and* peace, from God our[5] Father and Jesus Christ [Christ Jesus][6] our Lord.

* [Latin: *Incipit ad Timotheum prima.* English Version: The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to Timothy; which is a translation of the title in the *Recepta.*

[1] Ver. 1.—[Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, instead of Ἰησ. Χριστ., the reading of the *Recepta*, and of Lachmann also. The Sinaiticus has Χριστ. Ἰησ.—E. H.]
[2] Ver. 1.—[κατ᾽ ἐπιταγήν. So all the authorities. The Sinaiticus has κατ᾽ ἐπαγγελίαν = according to the promise, &c.; cf. 2 Tim. i. 1. But the true reading, doubtless, is the received.—E. H.]
[3] Ver. 1.—[Θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν; the order of these words varies much in the later MSS. See Tischendorf; so Huther.—E. H.]
[4] Ver. 1.—Received text: *Lord* Jesus Christ. [Omitted by Lachmann and Tischendorf; found in the Sinaiticus. In the Minuscules, καὶ is left out, or placed sometimes before σωτῆρος, according to Huther.—E. H.]
[5] Ver. 2.—[ἡμῶν; in the *Recepta*, but to be omitted; is omitted by our author in his text.—E. H.]
[6] Ver. 2.—[Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ; so Lachmann and Tischendorf, supported by the weightiest authorities. The Sinaiticus the same.—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **Paul.** See, in reference to his person, the statements of the Acts of the Apostles, and the preceding Pauline Epistles.—**By the commandment,** κατ᾽ ἐπιταγήν. The Apostle begins his work thus, because he would enforce his apostolic authority against heretical teachers. The same expression occurs in Titus i. 3, and refers to the Divine commission of the Apostle, the foundation of which was θέλημα Θεοῦ, to which he alludes in other places, as 2 Tim. i. 1 (comp. Gal. i. 1). We do not, however, discover in this an undesigned expression of his confidence in the Divine origin and character of his apostleship (Matthies). We believe, rather, that the Apostle uses this word designedly, in order to give to his admonitions their due authority.—**God our Saviour,** σωτῆρος ἡμῶν (comp. Jude, 25; Luke i. 47). The representation of God the Father as Saviour is peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles; while in the other Pauline Epistles, the name is usually given to Christ. It is obvious that this name is applied to the Father, in view of that which He has done, through Christ, for the salvation of mankind.—**Our hope.** One of those rich expressions which lose their power and beauty in any paraphrase (comp. John xi. 25; Col. i. 27; Eph. ii. 14, and similar passages). The conception is as little exhausted, whether we consider Christ exclusively as the foundation, or exclusively as the object of hope; rather, both conceptions are to be so blended, that we shall see in Christ the living centre of the Christian hope. "*In eo solo residet tota salutis nostræ materia;*" Calvin. It is Christ, in and through whom alone our hope in the Divine σωτηρία is realized.

Ver. 2. **Own son in the faith,** γνησίῳ τέκνῳ, not κατὰ σάρκα, but ἐν πίστει; which last word must not be joined with γνησίῳ, but with τέκνῳ, and denotes the sphere in which the relationship has grown between Paul and Timothy (comp. 1 Cor. iv

14–17; Gal. iv. 19). Titus, in chap. i. 4, is greeted with the same name of honor, κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν. The Apostle feels inwardly moved to give such prominence to the bond which unites him in Timothy; and from this spring of inner love now bursts his noble intercessory prayer. [The English Version reads, "in the faith;" but it is better "in faith." So Conybeare, and others. Alford and Wordsworth, however, retain the former reading.—W.]—**Grace, mercy, and peace.** A new characteristic of the Pastoral Epistles, that mercy is named in the salutation, while elsewhere St. Paul is wont to entreat only grace and peace for his readers (compare, however, Gal. vi. 16; Jude 2). It is not possible that a writer of fiction would have allowed such slight deviations; he would rather have been careful to copy, as literally as possible, the Apostle's usual form of salutation. This difference gives us an internal proof, in its degree, of the genuineness of the Epistle. The chief motive by which the Apostle felt himself compelled, from the fulness of his heart, to join this third word to the other two, was doubtless his own personal feeling. As his life drew nearer its close, and he felt more deeply his weakness, his coming end, the ἔλεος was the foundation of his hope; and for Timothy, too, with grace and peace, it was the one thing needful. "*Misericordia dicit gratiam quasi teneriorem erga miserabiles, et hujus misericordiæ divinæ experientia affert habilitatem ad ministerium evangelicum*," vers. 13, 16; Bengel. We may call grace the highest good for the guilty, mercy for the suffering, and peace for the struggling disciple of the Lord. In its harmony, this ravishing threefold chord expresses all the spiritual gifts which the Christian should ask for himself and his brethren.—**Christ Jesus.** Here, as very frequently in the Epistles to Timothy, the official name, The Christ, in which the Messianic promises are fulfilled, is placed before the name of the historic person, Jesus.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. As it was not necessary for Timothy to be assured of the apostolic authority of Paul, since he had not the least doubt of it, it becomes more evident here that the Apostle attaches to it a high significance, when it is named even in the beginning of this letter. We often hear the superficial notion advanced, that the Apostles, as the first witnesses of the personal appearing of Christ, had some advantage over later teachers, but that there is, after all, no essential inequality. If this were true, the Pastoral Epistles would have, in many respects, an entirely different character. We hear in them not merely an elder teacher addressing his younger brethren in office, not merely a spiritual father addressing his son, but an Apostle giving exhortations to his youthful fellow-laborers, in a tone which admits no contradiction, and expects nothing but obedience for Christ's sake in all he prescribes and ordains (comp. 2 Cor. vii. 15, 16). If we once admit that the spirit of truth was given to each one (πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον, 1 Cor. xii. 7), it lies in the very nature of the case, that with the *munus apostolicum quâ tale*, *charismata* were joined, which other teachers of the church could not enjoy, or, at least, to the same degree. The Lord, who has appointed some apostles, and some evangelists (Eph. iv. 11, 12), has by no means made the latter equal to the former. This misconception of the principle of authority begets the most unchecked wilfulness and private opinion, and brings us not to the feet of the Apostle, but under the sceptre of every writer who may place himself and his word above that of St. Paul. The recognition of the apostolic authority is the best palladium against the threefold enemy which assails the evangelical church in our day—Mysticism, Rationalism, and Romanism; comp. P. JALAGUYER, *Inspiration du Nouveau Testam.*, Paris, 1851; especially p. 51–89.

2. The recognition of Jesus Christ as our hope involves, if it have any significance whatever, the recognition of His real divinity. If the Lord be nothing more than a mere man, as many modern theologians represent, then we are not free to call Him our hope, without narrowing greatly our conception of its meaning. The Scriptures pronounce a fearful judgment upon all who trust in an arm of flesh; comp. Jer. xvii. 5, 6; Ps. cxviii. 8, 9; cxlvi. 3.

3. The apostolic benediction, "Grace, mercy, and peace," illustrates the character of the gospel, as essentially different not only from the law, but from every merely human and philosophic system of religion. All grace, mercy, and peace which God can bestow, come to us only through and in communion with His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ; comp. John xiv. 6.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The significance of Paul's title, the Apostle of the Lord.—Paul the Apostle, for all ages and centuries.—The calling of Paul to the apostolic office a good to all Christendom.—The nature, foundation, and value of the apostolic authority.—God the Saviour of all men, but especially of those that believe (1 Tim. iv. 10).—Christ the Lord of the Church.—Christ our hope: (1.) What does this name involve? (2.) What does it demand?—Christ (1.) can be our hope, for He is the true God; (2.) will be our hope, for He is the Mediator between God and man; (3.) must be our hope, for there is salvation in no other.—The communion of saints.—The strong tie that unites together spiritual fathers and their children.—The high value of the gospel blessings.—The grace, the mercy, and the peace of God, in their relation to the faith, the love, and the hope of the Christian.—Jesus Christ the source whence all spiritual blessings flow to us.—What must the Christian ask first and chiefly for his brethren?

OSIANDER: If Paul be a messenger of God, we ought to regard his writings as nothing else than the infallible word of God (Luke x. 16).—No man ought to preach without a due calling in the church (Heb. v. 4).—ANTON: The majesty of God can only be constantly and lovingly manifest in the face of Jesus Christ. If Christ be our hope, then we certainly must not rest our hope on the saints, or on our own merit, but recognize Christ as the only Redeemer.—The office and work of the preacher are means by which spiritual sons and daughters are born to God (Philem. 10).—LANGE's *Opus bibl.:* Every believing reader of this benediction should put himself in the place of Timothy, and make it his own, since he knows and honors God as his Father, and Christ as his Lord.

II.

Occasion for the writing of this Epistle.—Preliminary description and condemnation of the heretical teachers who had appeared at Ephesus, who misunderstood equally the nature both of the Law and of the Gospel.

Ch. I. 3–11.

3 As[1] I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia,
4 that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine, Neither give
heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions [questionings],
rather than godly edifying [the dispensation of God][2] which is in faith: *so do.*
5 Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and *of* a good
6 conscience, and *of* faith unfeigned: From which some having swerved have
7 turned aside unto vain jangling; Desiring to be teachers of the law; under-
8 standing [considering] neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm. But we
9 know that the law *is* good, if a man use[3] it lawfully; Knowing this, that the
law is not made [set forth = *posita*] for a righteous man, but for the lawless and
disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for the unholy and profane, for
10 murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers,[4] for man-slayers, For whore-
mongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for men-stealers, for liars,
for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound
11 doctrine: According to the glorious gospel [the gospel of glory] of the blessed
God, which was committed to my trust [which I have been entrusted with].

[1] Ver. 3.—[No apodosis to καθώς. Lachmann brackets vers. 5–17; but this scarcely meets the case. Perhaps we had better supply, with our author, at the end of ver. 4, *so now also I exhort thee.* So likewise Conybeare and Howson.—E. H.]

[2] Ver. 4.—Dispensation (*Haushaltung*), according to the reading οἰκονομίαν, instead of the οἰκοδομίαν of the *Recepta*, which has scarcely any critical confirmation at all. The reading οἰκονομίαν is supported by such weighty authorities (now also by the Sinaiticus), that its accuracy cannot be doubted. Matthäi says: "*οἰκονομίαν, ita omnes omnino mei, ac ii quidem, qui scholia habent, etiam in scholiis uti quoque interpretes editi. οἰκοδομίαν nihil nisi error est typothetarum Erasmi, ὃ cum ν confuso nisi Erasmus deliberate ita correxerit ad latinum: ædificationem;*" Huther.

[3] Ver. 8.—[Lachmann, on the authority of A., reads χρήσηται; the rest have χρῆται. So also the Sinaiticus.—E. H.]

[4] Ver. 9.—[πατρολῴαις, μητρολῴαις. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Sinaiticus, instead of πατρα., μητρα.—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 3. **Besought.** For the occasion and object of this exhortation, see the Introduction. Timothy must remain at Ephesus, προσμεῖναι (the same word occurs in Acts xviii. 18), in order, by his presence, to oppose the evil which was becoming apparent there. The simplest explanation of this somewhat singular phrase, is, that Paul had already, at Ephesus, given this injunction to Timothy, and had then left him in order to set out on his journey to Macedonia. According to Chrysostom, the form in which this admonition is couched is a proof of the friendly spirit of the Apostle towards Timothy: "*οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν: ἐπέταξα, οὐδὲ ἐκέλευσα, οὐδὲ παρῄνεσα, ἀλλὰ τί; παρεκάλεσά σε.*"—**Some.** In other places, also, the Apostle speaks, without any personal designation, of those whom he calls upon Timothy to oppose (vers. 6, 19; chap. iv. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 18). Timothy knew them from his own experience, and needed, therefore, no more exact advice. He was to charge them, not at once publicly (Matthies), yet in an earnest and emphatic way, to teach no other doctrine than that which the Apostle had before delivered. Ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν (comp. chap. vi. 3; Tit. i. 13). The word indicates the strange elements that may mingle with the teaching of the gospel, and easily assume a character hostile to it. The same warning Paul had already given, in another form, to the elders of the church (Acts xx. 29). The pure doctrine, in which men must steadfastly abide, is naturally, in his thought, identical with his gospel (2 Tim. ii. 8).

Ver. 4. **Fables and endless genealogies** (comp. Tit. i. 14; 1 Tim. iv. 7; 2 Tim. iv. 4; Tit. iii. 9). It is difficult to know with certainty what μῦθοι and γενεαλογίαι are here specially meant. From all that we gather, however, in this Epistle, it is most probable that reference is made to fables of *Jewish* form and origin, which were endlessly spun out, and had called forth much dispute in the church. "Although there were many fables among the heathen, yet the Apostle has in special view the Jewish *traditiones;* for it was asserted that Moses had not written down all the mysteries revealed by God, but had given much orally to the elders, by whom they were handed down as a traditional law, or Kabbala, although these Jewish notions were mostly of their own invention, and in part, too, drawn from heathen philosophy;" Starke. The genealogical records here mentioned appear also to have been mainly of Jewish origin, and, as we know, were held in high repute, and gave occasion for many useless and curious questions; although we need not entirely exclude a reference to the doctrine of Emanation, taught by the heretical schools. The ζητήσεις are nothing but the foolish questions (Tit. iii. 9), which lead to strife and discord. This love

of fables and genealogies is held by the Apostle in such great aversion, because it furnished such material for dispute, rather than for a right knowledge of the essential way of redemption (*οἰκονομία*). "*Μᾶλλον, non semper comparationis sed sæp'us correctionis et oppositionis nota est* (comp. 2 Tim. i. 4);" Glassius. Most commentators agree that the clause which begins the third verse should be understood to close at the end of the fourth verse, with an *οὕτω καὶ νῦν παρακαλῶ*, which certainly might be most fitly inserted in this place. Otherwise it must be supposed that the Apostle, after a long digression (vers. 5–7), takes up again, at ver. 18, the thread of the broken exhortation; ver. 5 or ver. 12 forms no perfect conclusion.

Ver. 5. **The end of the commandment.** It is a question, whether reference is made to the command given by Paul, in ver. 3, to Timothy, or, in a wider sense, to the Divine commandment in general, which Timothy is to impress upon his hearers. The latter is the more probable, since the Apostle begins forthwith to oppose a false view of the Mosaic law. "Παραγγελία, practical teaching as the chief element of the διδασκαλία ὑγιαίνουσα; a contract to the μῦθοι;" De Wette.—**End**; Luther: The sum, as this word designates that to which we are chiefly to look, and toward which we are to strive. "The ultimate aim of all the admonitions of the Christian preacher should be practical—to call out a true love;" Olshausen. Even to Timothy, Paul writes very little of the mysteries of Christianity, that, by his example, he may yet more put to shame this germinal Gnosticism.—**Charity out of a pure heart,** &c. Love, "the bond of all Christian virtues," the fruit of the tree, whose root, faith, is presupposed as already existing, and commended at the close of the exhortation. This love can only spring out of a pure heart, cleansed from all selfishness and evil desires; out of a good conscience, which, being free from the guilt of sin, and reconciled with God, can then first love in truth; and from an unfeigned faith.—**Unfeigned,** ἀνυπόκριτος; that is, no empty thought or fancy, but a spiritual light and spiritual life not consisting in words, but in a living assurance of the heart, and proving its life in its fruits. Without real faith there is no good conscience; without a reconciliation of the conscience there is no pure heart; without a pure heart there is no true Christian love conceivable. Thus all are blended in the closest union. [Alford: "It is faith—not the pretence of faith, the mere *Scheinglaube* of the hypocrite. . . . Wiesinger well remarks, that we see that the general character of these false teachers, as of those against whom Titus is warned, was not so much error in doctrine, as leading men astray from the earnestness of the loving Christian life to useless and vain questionings, ministering only strife."]

Ver. 6. **From which . . . vain jangling.** Ὧν, that is, from the Christian dispositions and virtues mentioned in ver. 5. The polemic character of the Epistle of Paul appears immediately after the statement of the τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας. The heretics were separatists, ἀστοχήσαντες; they had failed of the end which the Apostle has set forth—the same word occurs in 1 Tim. vi. 21; 2 Tim. ii. 18—and were thus astray in a false path, because they had turned εἰς ματαιολογίαν. The etymology indicates the meaning of this word, which, besides, is found only here. (Tit. i. 10, ματαιολόγοι occurs). Here is suggested that waste of words, that empty talk, in which there can be found no rational sense, no unity of conviction. Compare the βέβηλοι κενοφωνίαι (chap. vi. 20), and the βέβηλοι καὶ γραώδεις μῦθοι (1 Tim. iv. 7; Tit. iii. 9). The character of this vain jangling is more exactly defined by what immediately follows, in ver. 7.

Ver. 7. **Teachers of the law,** νομοδιδάσκαλοι, not in a good, but in a bad, unevangelical sense of this word; men who so mixed together law and gospel, that the latter was weakened, and who would likewise force a Mosaic system upon the Christian, in the notion that they themselves had pierced deeper than others into its nature and spirit. It is the same Jewish legalism, which, in its special relation to the Gentiles, the Apostle opposes in Rom. xii. 17 and Gal. vi. 20; because, in its inmost spirit, it is in irreconcilable conflict with Christian truth and freedom. In the keenest way, throughout the following verses, it is held up to view in its utter nakedness, μὴ νοοῦντες, κ.τ.λ. "*Bonus doctor debet esse intelligens, simul'que certus: istis, inquit Paulus, utrumque deest;*" Bengel. They themselves understand not what they say, nor whereof they affirm. If we may draw a distinction between these two expressions, the former seems to mean the subjective opinions, the expressed ideas, the fictions of these men; while the second designates the objective views, the material, on which they based their convictions with the greatest confidence, but into which, according to the assertion of Paul, they had no clear insight. So also Raphelius: "*Qui neque ea, quæ loquuntur satis intelligant, neque quibus de rebus loquantur, considerant.*" What these νομοδιδάσκαλοι held as to the unaltered authority of the Mosaic law, rested on their plain ignorance of the very purpose of the law; which is therefore, in the 8th and following verses, designedly placed by the Apostle in its true light. It appears, also, from this whole argument, that these heretics were not already separated from the community, or in opposition to it—in which case Timothy could have had no further influence over them—but they were still within its pale. It is worthy of note, too, that they continually sought authority in the writings of the Old Testament for their half-heathen speculations.

Ver. 8. **But we know.** An authoritative apostolic οἴδαμεν, of quite other worth than that of the Scribes and Pharisees (John ix. 29, 31). The Apostle places the declaration of his knowledge, which he had learned in the school of the Holy Ghost, against the arrogant view of the false Gnosis. Perhaps its advocates had thought to raise a suspicion against him, as if he despised the law, or, at least, denied it any real worth. He opposes to this his doctrine, which he fully knows will be received by Timothy—that the law is good (properly, beautiful, καλός), and in itself blameless (comp. Rom. vii. 12); yet only on condition that every man use the same lawfully, νομίμως, which was not done by these heretics. A play upon the word; as if to say, that the law must be fulfilled according to law. We have special cause to be thankful that the true definition of the law has been so fully stated by Paul in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, as rightly to explain 1 Tim. i. 8–10. Νομίμως is the use of the law by the man who allows it to exercise its proper office, who is brought by it to a knowledge of his own sin and liability to punishment. "This knowledge will give us its spirit and intent—not room for idle questions and subtleties, nor for self-deception through a feigned and outward righteousness. This lawful use of the law is meant by Christ,

when He promises life to those who keep the law (Luke x. 28; chap. xviii. 20, *et seq.*);" Von Gerlach. It is self-evident, also, that Paul in this place speaks not of the hearer or the reader of the law, but solely of its application by its teachers, who may well reflect on the verses which follow.

Ver. 9. **That the law is not made for a righteous man.** It is not strange that this passage should at first awaken surprise in many readers, and that, at the time of the Reformation, it should have been controverted by Agricola. The first question is, whom the Apostle means by this righteous man—a question which is at once answered by the antithesis following it, ἀνόμοις δὲ, κ.τ.λ. In distinction from this, the person meant by δίκαιος may be one whose life is righteous and moral according to the requirements of the law. But since, according to the invariable doctrine of the Apostle, all who are under the law are also under the curse of the law, so that by the works of the law no flesh can be justified (Gal. iii. 10; Rom. iii. 20), it follows, that by the righteous Christian man must be meant one who has been justified by faith in Christ, and wholly renewed by the Holy Spirit (*justus per justificationem, et per sanctificationem*). Of such a man Paul says, that the law is not made for *him*, νόμος οὐ κεῖται. As the article is wanting before νόμος, it may be thought that only a general proposition is stated as to the nature and purpose of any moral code (Chrysostom, Brentano). But the mention of the gospel in contrast with the law (ver. 11), and the argument against the νομοδιδάσκαλοι (ver. 7), imperatively requires us here to understand the *Mosaic* law alone. On the omission of the article, see WINER'S *Grammar, in loco.* This law, then, is not made for the righteous man; that is, it is not given to him, *as such.* When De Wette says, "This view of the law seems foreign to the Apostle," he seems to forget entirely such passages as Gal. v. 18-23. The thought, that the letter of the Mosaic law possesses no more binding force for the redeemed in Christ, is so entirely Pauline, that it forms one of the main pillars of his whole doctrinal structure. It certainly gives also a fulfilment of the law from the Christian standpoint, as it is announced in Rom. iii. 31; viii. 4, and in other places. But in this passage the Apostle expressly shows its meaning for the wholly unconverted, in order to expose more clearly the folly of those heretics who will put the law by the side of, or even above the gospel, for the Christian. [Augustin on Ps. i.: "*Justus non est sub lege, quia in lege Domini est voluntas ejus; qui enim in lege est, secundum legem agitur; ille ergo liber est; hic servus.*" HOOKER, *Eccl. Pol.*, B. 1, c. 8. "A law is a directive rule unto goodness of operation. The rule of Divine operation is the definitive appointment of God's own wisdom set down within Himself. The rule of natural agents that work by necessity is the determination of the wisdom of God, known to God, but not unto them. The rule of voluntary agents on earth is the venture that reason giveth concerning the goodness of those things which they are to do. . . . Neither must we suppose that there needeth one rule to know the good, and another the evil by. For he that knoweth the straight, doth even thereby discern the crooked. Goodness in actions is like unto straightness; wherefore, that which is done well, we term *right.*"—W.]—**But for the lawless.** In contrast to this true spirit of law, the Apostle now names a long list of evildoers, for whom the law remained in full force; a list in which one familiar with the Pauline writings will not expect completeness, systematic order, or logical strictness, in its various conceptions; yet which by no means lacks connection, and has clearly this thought at the bottom, that they who are most zealous for the law often most grossly transgress it (comp. Rom. ii. 20). He names, at the outset, two by two, six classes of wicked men—ἀνόμοις καὶ ἀνυποτάκτοις; that is, such as care nothing for the law, and have altogether refused obedience to it (comp. Titus i. 6-10); ἀσεβέσι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοῖς, godless (comp. Titus ii. 12) and gross sinners, who have no fear of God in their hearts (comp. Rom. iv. 5; v. 6). Here the hostile attitude toward God becomes more prominent, while the preceding two are violators of the law in general. Ἀνοσίοις καὶ βεβήλοις blend both the first conceptions, as the irreligious and profane, here depicted, are alike despisers of the Holy God, and of His holy law. Here follow, more in detail, certain *specimina mali*, from which we may suppose that, with the exception of the last *vitium*, ἐπιόρκοις, the various statutes of the second table passed before the mind of the Apostle. He names the murder of father and mother—those who violate the first commandment with promise (Eph. vi. 2), and grossly abuse their parents (πατραλοίας; ὁ τὸν πατέρα ἀτιμάζων, τύπτων ἢ κτείνων; Hesychius). *Murderer*, consequently a breaker of the sixth commandment, ἀνδροφόνοις; in the New Testament an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον. Further, those who sin against the seventh commandment, commit fornication with women (πόρνοις), or with the male sex (ἀρσενοκοίταις), comp. Rom. i. 27; both natural and unnatural crime (comp. Levit. xix. and xxiii.). Then follow transgressions of the eighth commandment, here wholly concerning men—the sin of *man-stealing*, specially forbidden in Exodus xxi. 16; Deut. xxiv. 7; ἀνδραποδισταῖς, *plagiariis.* It was, besides, no rare crime among the Greeks to steal boys or girls, that they might be sold into slavery. Lastly follow those who break the ninth commandment, ψεῦσται, ἐπίορκοι; such as deliberately speak falsehood, or swear to a falsehood, or break an oath already taken. By the following εἴ τι ἕτερον, κ.τ.λ., we may suppose meant transgression against the tenth commandment, which is here omitted. We find, however, in this *catalogus criminum*, no orderly reference to the commandments of the first table; and Bengel has clearly gone too far, when he writes, "*Paulus pro ordine decalogi hic nominat injustos.*" This is true only of the second half of the decalogue.—**And if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine.** Sound doctrine—one of the expressions characteristic of the Pastoral Epistles (comp. 2 Tim. iv. 3; Titus ii. 1, and elsewhere). Not healthful doctrine is meant (Luther), nor a sound morality (Leo), but the Christian teaching in general is approved in its inner soundness, as opposed to the ματαιολογία of the heretics. This phrase is used also to express those symptoms of disease which St. Paul saw with grief springing up in the church (comp. 2 Tim. ii. 17). [It is observable that the word "wholesome" occurs nine times in the Pastoral Epistles, and always in reference to doctrine; Wordsworth.—W.]

Ver. 11. **According to the glorious gospel . . . committed to my trust.** Κατά is not used here for the more exact definition of sound doctrine, as some have thought; for, in that case, τῇ would have to be repeated before κατά; nor need it be supposed in apposition to ἀντίκειται, which would

give a very awkward conclusion. Verse 11 is an addition, which refers to the whole preceding line of thought, and means that, according to the gospel of Paul, the law has no other purpose than that fully explained in vers. 6–10. The Apostle would have us understand, that his view of the law is not the fruit of his private opinion, but rather the true summary of the gospel committed to him. This qualification of the gospel is really apologetic. The gospel of glory, *τῆς δόξης*, not signifying *ἔνδοξον* (Heydenreich), in the sense of blessed, glorious doctrine, but the gospel by which the glory of God in Christ has become manifest to the world; whose especial and chief substance is this Divine glory (2 Cor. iv. 4), and indeed the glory of the blessed God, *τοῦ μακαρίου Θεοῦ* (comp. 1 Tim. vi. 15). If God Himself be blessed, then the revelation of His glory, which has been proclaimed, not through the law, but through the gospel, will be full of blessing. Perhaps the repeated use of the epithet in this Epistle has a certain reference to the system of Æons taught by the heretics. This gospel is committed in trust to Paul, *ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ*. A peculiarly Pauline construction, on which, comp. WINER, *Gramm. N. T.*, p. 40. In other places, too, the Apostle speaks with warmth of this his dear prerogative; as Rom. xv. 16; Eph. iii. 8; Col. i. 25. Those who oppose the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles, are therefore wrong in thinking such emphatic reference to his person and his office at all extraordinary. The consciousness which Paul had of his high calling, rises with redoubled power as he contends with the heretics; and in this letter to his friend and scholar he follows the warm outpouring of his spirit, not in a logical order, yet in harmony with his whole thought, as we read in vers. 12–17.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Two opposite views, in regard to the character and condition of the early Christian Church have prevailed, with more or less success, in our time, both of which are disproved in the opening verses of the first Pastoral Epistle. In the one view, it is thought that the apostolic age was a kind of paradisaic state of the young community—a state full of love, and innocence, and purity; in contrast with which the post-apostolic age seems a fall, like that of our first parents (Thiersch, and others). In the other view, there was at first only a chaos of manifold parties and tendencies, out of which there gradually rose, in the second century, after many conciliatory efforts, the harmonious structure of the Catholic church (Tübingen school). But the little we have already learned from the Epistle to Timothy neither favors the one nor the other view. It is apparent that already, soon after A. D. 60, heresies and factions sprang up in the church, hostile to the original spirit of Christianity, which the Apostle believed that he must oppose with all his energy. We find that the germs of Gnosticism, whose formal development we can trace in the second century under manifold shapes, were already broadcast in the second half of the first century. But, on the other hand, this error appears only as a fleck of rust on the pure metal of that truth, earlier taught and fully acknowledged. We see the Apostle, clothed with an authority which no one can defy with impunity, and rising high above the strife of parties. His gospel is no other in substance than that proclaimed by his fellow-Apostles, and by his and their co-workers. His word becomes the sharp but healthful corrective of the errorists, who have gained head so early; and it remains the norm of its development for the church, in the second and the succeeding centuries.

2. The characteristic marks of the heretics of the first century rise here already to our view. A sickly search after the discovery of the unattainable, with a thankless misconception of simple truth; an undue valuing of lesser things, with a depreciation of the essentials of Christianity; a striving after their own honor, while they cared little for the edification of believers; a fastening of their own philosophic theories on the falsely-interpreted letter of the Scriptures, whose spirit they sadly misconceived; a denial of the practical nature of Christianity, while its real freedom is abused as an allowance to the flesh; a falsehood as to the special relation between the law and the gospel of Christ;—all these symptoms of disease are found anew, in countless forms, among the sectaries and heretics of later days.

3. The Apostle is alike removed from the one-sided view either of a love without faith, or of a faith without love. He will neither have the fruit without the tree, nor the tree without the fruit. He knows only the one requirement of the gospel—love; yet only the love blossoming in a heart purified through faith. Here, as afterwards more frequently, purity of faith and purity of conscience are linked in their inmost relationship.

4. "Love, out of a pure heart," &c. In this statement of the chief requisite of Christianity there is confirmed the essential unity of theology and morality, whose arbitrary separation so often does unmeasured injury to each, and has kept many from the right understanding of the gospel.

5. We have here a weighty help toward answering the question, how far the Mosaic law has a binding power. But fully to understand the Apostle's mode of thought upon this subject, the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians must be specially compared. Here, also, Paul appears the same glowing and zealous advocate, as he had before shown himself, of the right of Christian freedom. While he exalts the worth of the law in its own proper sphere, beyond any disparagement, he shows its entire insufficiency whenever it is placed by the side of, or above the gospel.

6. We find the chief forms of Judaism in the time of our Lord, again existing in His earliest church—Pharisaism and Sadduceeism. Against this united power of self-righteousness and unrighteousness, the disciple no less than the Master is pledged to bear the sword of the Spirit with all power (Matt. xvi. 6).

7. A precept, of the first importance in pastoral theology, is here given by the Apostle to the preachers of the Word. It is not enough to preach the truth free from all error; but they are also bound to contend with every energy against error. Persecution of heretics is indeed unchristian and unevangelical, and its frightful traces remain on many a page of Church history, marked with blood and tears. Yet he would be no less to blame, who, like Timothy a ruler in the church, capable of large influence, should allow the errorist to go unchecked, and remain satisfied, if not himself corrupted by the leaven of error. The bee which has lost its sting can produce no more honey. The saying of Calvin is that of every true witness of Jesus Christ: "A

dog barks loudly when one seizes his master; and should I be silent when the truth of God is assailed?" Polemics against leading heretics ought not to be the chief staple of gospel preaching; nor should this be wholly and always lost sight of.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

No doctrine should be permitted or preached in the church but the unadulterated apostolic doctrine. —The relation of Mythology to Christianity.—The difference between the holy "mystery of the gospel," and a sickly mysticism.—A sermon whose first and last fruit is strife and dispute, instead of the promotion of the Divine way of redemption, is thereby self-condemned.—The sum of the commandment: (1.) No Christianity without love; (2.) no Christian love without purity of heart; (3.) no purity of heart without a good conscience; (4.) no good conscience without an unsullied faith.—How far we may swerve from the end of the Divine revelation, even when we believe ourselves very near to it.—The attitude of the Christian toward the law.—Among the confessors of the gospel there were and are at all times (1.) some, who are neither under the law nor under grace; (2.) others, who are indeed under the law, but not yet under grace; (3.) others, who are under grace, and no more under the law.—The worth of the law as a bar, as a mirror, as a seal. [German: *Riegel*, *Spiegel*, *u. Siegel.*]—For whom the law is given, and for whom not.—The Christian redeemed from the curse of the law, so that the righteousness required by the law is fulfilled in him.—Every gross or slight, open or concealed immorality, is directly opposed to sound doctrine.—A noble eulogy of the gospel: (1.) The gospel of the glory of God; (2.) this God, the blessed God; (3.) through this blessed God, the ministry of the gospel is entrusted to a man like Paul.—Every estimate of the law that does not accord with the gospel of Paul deserves to be rejected.—The ceaseless alternation of Legalism and Antinomianism in the Christian Church: (1.) Its traces; (2.) its causes; (3.) its import; (4.) its only remedy.—[IGNATIUS: 'Αρχὴ μὲν πίστις, τέλος τὲ ἀγάπη. Faith the beginning, but love the end, or final cause.—W.]

STARKE: OSIANDER: The pure doctrine is a great gift of God, therefore it is to be guarded well; a costly loan, therefore to be well laid out.—LANGE'S *Opus Bibl.:* Pure doctrine and a godly life must always go together.—HEDINGER: What helps not growth in godliness, we ought to banish from church and school.—ANTON: If the enemy cannot else lead us astray in our Christianity, he sings to us of high things, which common Christians do not know.—LANGE'S *Op.:* Theologians must especially care that they do not become loose talkers, and thus corrupters of others.—In nothing is pride more perceptible, more hurtful, and perilous, than in spiritual things.—Every preacher of the gospel is also a teacher of the law; for the gospel shows how man can and ought to hold the law of God in the gospel way. —QUESNEL: Gospel doctrine does not so hold up faith as to bend the law (1 Cor. ix. 21).—Sins must not be judged by human fancy, but according to the law and the gospel.—Sins that are forbidden in the law, are also contrary to the gospel (Rom. iii. 31).—ANTON: In the office of preacher, the whole aim must be to know the gospel as a gospel of the glory of God (2 Cor. iv. 6).

[CUDWORTH, *Sermon I.:* Christ came not into the world to fill our heads with mere speculations, to kindle a fire of wrangling and contentious dispute, whilst, in the mean time, our hearts remain all ice within toward God. Christ was *vitæ magister*, not *scholæ;* and he is the best Christian whose heart beats with the purest pulse toward heaven; not he, whose head spinneth out the finest cobwebs. Ink and paper can never make us Christians—can never beget a new nature, a living principle in us—can never form Christ, or any true notions of spiritual things, in our hearts. A painter that would draw a rose, though he may flourish some likeness of it in figure and color, yet he can never paint the scent and fragrancy.—DONNE, *Sermons:* As the soul is infused by God, but diffused over the whole body, and so there is a man; so faith is infused from God, but diffused into our works, and so there is a saint. Practice is the incarnation of faith; faith is incorporate and manifest in a body by works.—W.]

III.

The Apostle's communication upon his calling to the ministry of the gospel, and upon the grace, in its high significance, which was glorified in him by his conversion.—Doxology.

CH. I. 12–17.

12 And[1] I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, who hath enabled me, for that he
13 counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry; Who was before[2] a blas-
phemer, and a persecutor, and injurious [insolent]: but I obtained mercy,
14 because I did *it* ignorantly in unbelief. And [But] the grace of our Lord was
15 exceeding abundant with faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. This is a
faithful saying [Faithful is the saying], and worthy of all acceptation, that
Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief [first
16 amongst whom am I]. Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first
[*i. e.*, sinner] Jesus Christ might shew forth all[3] long-suffering, for a pattern to

17 [of ?] them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting. Now unto the King eternal [of ages], immortal, invisible, the only wise [alone wise][4] God, *be* honor and glory for ever and ever. Amen.

[1] Ver. 12.—καὶ is wanting in A. F. G., and others, and upon this account has been left out by Lachmann. On the other hand, it is retained by Tischendorf. It is not in the Sinaiticus.

[2] Ver. 13.—[Τὸν προτ., *Recepta*. The authorities are in favor of τό. So also Lachmann, Tischendorf, and the Sinaiticus. Τὸν was probably an attempted correction of the text. After ὄντα Lachmann inserts με; Tischendorf omits; not in the Sinaiticus.—E. H.]

[3] Ver. 16.—[πᾶσαν; ἅπασαν is the reading adopted by modern critics. So also in the Sinaiticus.—E. H.]

[4] Ver. 17.—Received text: μόνῳ σοφῷ; wherefore, also, Luther: "To the alone *wise*." On the ground of A. D.[1] F. G., and others, Griesbach removes σοφῷ from the text; and his example has been almost universally followed. σοφῷ is also not in the Sinaiticus. [The English Version, like Luther, "only wise."—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 12. **And I thank**, &c. Criticism asks how this sentence can have any just connection with the rest, and finds in this prominent setting forth of the apostolate a ground of doubt. Psychology might better ask, whether a man like Paul, in a familiar letter, could withhold such an expression, since in ver. 11 he had begun to speak of his high prerogative. Besides, this personal allusion is the less out of place, because, among the heretics at Ephesus, there were some certainly who sought to undermine the authority of Paul by allusions to his former history, or even by venturing doubts of his miraculous calling from the Lord. This reference to himself was, again, most appropriate, as an illustration from his own living experience, of his statement in vers. 8–11, in relation to the law and the gospel.—**Who hath enabled me.** We need not refer this exclusively to ability for the conversion of men (Bengel), or for the endurance of trial (Chrysostom), or for the doing of miracles (Mack), although none of these need be left out. Without any limitation, Paul refers here to the Divine power which he had in every way received, from the time of his calling to the present. "*Quo verbo non modo intelligit, se dei manu principio esse formatum, ut idoneus ad munus suum foret, sed simul complectitur continuam gratiæ subministrationem. Neque enim satis fuisset, semel esse fidelem declaratum, nisi eum perpetuo auxilio confirmasset Christus;*" Calvin.—**For that he . . . into the ministry,** πιστόν με ἡγήσατο. Fidelity is the trait especially required of the ministers of the gospel (comp. 1 Cor. iv. 2). Thus the Lord counted Paul faithful—in other words, saw in him one who would prove faithful; and this was the mark of Christ's trust, that He had given him such an office, θέμενος εἰς διακονίαν; just as a proprietor gives one of his dependents a striking proof of his confidence, when he makes him steward over the rest. The omniscient Lord of the Church foresaw Paul's fidelity, and sanctified him as a chosen instrument. That the Apostle regarded this fidelity not as of his own merit, but as a gift of grace, appears from 1 Cor. vii. 25.

Ver. 13. **Who was before**, &c. A fuller confession of his former character, in order to express more clearly the ground of his thankfulness (ver. 12).—**Blasphemer**, against the name and truth of the Lord (comp. Acts xvi. 11).—**Persecutor**, of Christians, both in word and in deed (comp. Acts xxii. 4; Gal. i. 13).—**Injurious**, ὑβριστής, (comp. Matt. xxii. 6; Rom. i. 30). "The last phrase strengthens the preceding, as it refers to the abuse springing from arrogance and contempt of others;" Wiesinger.—**But I obtained mercy**, &c. Not only because he obtained forgiveness of sins, but because, also, he was called to the apostolic office, established in it, and counted faithful; ver. 12. And why? **Because I did it ignorantly, in unbelief.** The Apostle does not at all deny that his unbelief was sinful, and thus deserving of punishment; he here refers merely to the one fact, which should mitigate this just sentence. The ἄγνοια in which he had lived made forgiveness possible, since he had not yet begun to sin against the Holy Ghost (comp. Luke xii. 45; xxiii. 34; Matt. xii. 31, 32). His ignorance did not at all merit forgiveness, but it left the possibility of it, without impairing the holiness and righteousness of the Lord. The positive ground of this act of mercy lay, at last, altogether in the Divine grace (comp. ver. 14 and Titus iii. 5). ["How could Christ have judged St. Paul faithful, when a persecutor? Some of the schoolmen, as Aquinas, suppose that πιστός is said by anticipation of St. Paul's future character, *ex provisis meritis;*" Wordsworth.—W.]

Ver. 14. **And the grace of our Lord was exceeding abundant,** ὑπερεπλεόνασε—the only instance in which this word is found in Paul. When he speaks of sin (Rom. v. 20), he there uses the word ἐπλεόνασεν; when, on the contrary, he tells of the mercy bestowed on him, he adds this most significant ὑπέρ. It is as if he wrestled with speech, fully to utter his overpowering feeling.—**With faith and love, which is in Christ Jesus.** Faith—not a childlike trust in God in general, but a faith whose object is Christ; here, as commonly in the Epistles of Paul, a faith united with love to Christ. "Not the love that Christ has and exercises, but that which He imparts to men" (Olshausen). This faith and this love are ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, because Jesus Himself is their centre (comp. Col. i. 4). And when the Apostle says that the grace of the Lord was exceeding abundant, with faith and love (μετά), he does not consider the process or the effects of this grace, but that personal, inward life in men which accompanies it: *indicatur*, κ.τ.λ., *quasi comites fuisse illius* χάριτος (Leo). Through this faith and this love he had reached the real possession and enjoyment of the mercy with which the Lord, of His free grace, had enriched him.

Ver. 15. **Faithful saying**, &c. Bengel: "Πιστός, *fidus, gravissima præfandi formula. Scit Paulus, quod dicit et de quo confirmet ipsaque sermonis simplicitate refutat secus docentes, eo communiora tractans, sed decore, quo abstrusiora affectabant alii. Sic quoque;*" Tit. ii. 1.—**And worthy of all acceptance,** πάσης ἀποδοχῆς, worthy of belief without any reservation whatever. The Apostle means an acceptance from which every doubt is excluded, and which thus acts through the intellect as well as the heart.—**That Christ Jesus**, &c. The expression, **came into the world,** has its full ex-

position in the truth of our Lord's preëxistence (comp. John xvi. 32). The word κόσμος is here to be understood not in a moral, but in a physical sense, as an opposite to the higher moral order of the world. Paul states the object of this incarnation without any limit whatever; for which reason, too, the article is omitted, ἁμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι (comp. Luke xix. 10; Rom. v. 6). The Pauline conception of σωτηρία is not opposed to a state of unhappiness in general, but to a lost state: "*Subest in hoc verbo emphasis, nam qui officium Christi esse fatentur salvare, cogitationem tamen hanc difficilius admittunt, quod ejusmodi salus ad peccatores pertineat. Semper enim abripitur sensus noster ad respectum dignitatis, simul atque indignitas apparet, concidit fiducia;*" Calvin.—**Of whom I am chief.** In a psychological view, it is noticeable how much trouble commentators have taken to turn aside from the clear import of this word, being more concerned, apparently, for the honor of Paul than he was himself. The best of these explanations may be found in De Wette. But whoever believes that a personal confession like this exceeds the bounds of truth, proves that he has very little conception of the humility and love of the Apostle, who freely allows that he is chief in the long catalogue of sinners, because he knows his own sin better than that of others, and gladly, too, esteems others better than himself (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 9; Phil. ii. 3; Eph. iii. 8).

Ver. 16. **Howbeit, for this,** &c. In proportion to the depth of his humility, he rises now in boldness of faith. Should any one wonder that such grace had reached the chief of sinners, Paul sets against this the cause (ἀλλά), and shows the world-wide significance of his own conversion. So great a sinner had for this very reason received grace, ἵνα Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἐνδείξηται τὴν ἅπασαν μακροθυμίαν.—**Long-suffering.** The Divine attribute of the Lord, whereby He does not at once punish the sinner, but prolongs the opportunity of repentance. In the pardon of one less wicked than Paul, this grace could not have shown its full glory; but in him, τῷ πρώτῳ, is revealed ἡ ἅπασα μακροθ., so that Paul's conversion appears a very marvel of the love of Jesus Christ for sinners. How much farther the purpose of this miracle reaches than to the Apostle and his contemporaries, is evident from what immediately follows.—**For a pattern to them . . . to life everlasting.** By the word ὑποτύπωσις, which is used again only in 2 Tim. i. 13, is denoted the original, normal, typical character of the event (τύπος, Rom. v. 14; ὑπόδειγμα, 2 Pet. ii. 6). Paul stood before the eyes of all after generations as a witness to the power, the grace, and the love of the Lord; so that the greatest of sinners need not doubt that grace. The Lord had dealt with him as the king of a rebellious city, who should release at once the rebel chief; as a physician in an hospital, who should cure the most diseased; so that thenceforth no guilty, no sick, need doubt the possibility of grace and salvation. In this sense Paul was a type, τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν ἐπ' αὐτῷ; "not so much in himself as an object of faith, but rather in his trustful belief, as the perfect assurance of our salvation," Rom. ix. 33; Matthies. The aim of this believing trust appears again from what immediately follows: εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. See, in Bengel, another less probable relation of the thought. It is not strange that, when the Apostle gives to this grace toward him a significance so great for all coming ages, his heart rises in a hymn of thanksgiving (ver. 17). And no wonder, also, that he speaks so fully here of his highest privilege; for not by the law, but the gospel only, could he praise the mercy of the Lord to him, and to so many after him. Thus this whole confession serves also as the confutation of the heretics, who had placed the former above the latter (comp. vers. 6–10).

Ver. 17. **Now unto the King eternal,** τῶν αἰώνων. According to some, King of the worlds; αἰῶνες is here taken in the sense of Heb. i. 2; so, *e. g.*, Leo: *regem totius mundi.* It is better, however, on account of the preceding τῶν μελλ. πιστ., to suppose that the Apostle had in his mind not the conception of space, but that of the succession of ages. Only in the process of time can the typical significance of the conversion of Paul (ver. 16) be fully realized; and God is the King of all the ages, in whom the later believers are brought together. The conception that the kingdom of God is an eternal dominion, lies not so much in the words τῶν αἰώνων (Wiesinger), as in the following ἀφθάρτῳ. It may be that this lofty yet rare expression (it occurs only in the Apocrypha of the Old Testament; comp. also Ps. cxlv. 13) may have flowed the more readily from the pen of the Apostle, because, in this letter, he opposes those heretics of Gnostic tendency who were wont to speak of Æons in an entirely different and fanciful sense.—**Immortal** (comp. Rom. i. 23 and 1 Tim. vi. 16), who alone has immortality.—**Invisible**, not only who is not seen, but who, in the nature of the case, cannot be seen (comp. John i. 18; 1 Tim. vi. 16; Heb. xi. 27).—**Only.** Σοφῷ with μόνῳ is a spurious interpolation, probably transferred from Rom. vi. 27.—**Forever and ever** (comp. Gal. i. 5; Phil. iv. 20). [Most recent English expositors agree with the German in rejecting σοφῷ; *e. g.*, Alford, Ellicott, Conybeare.—W.] This doxology, if compared with others, shows in every feature such a Pauline character, that it deserves to be placed among the evidences for, not against (Schleiermacher, and others), the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. It is admitted that Paul was wont to regard the whole history of the Divine revelation, under the old covenant, from a typical and symbolic standpoint. The creation, for instance, of the man and the woman, the first sin, the life of faith in Abraham, the relation between Sarai and Hagar, the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, and their fortune in the desert, are not isolated historic facts, but point with higher significance to great truths, or to ever-recurring laws (see 1 Cor. x. 1, &c.; Gal. iv. 23, and elsewhere). In the same manner he considers the event of his own conversion. It stands before his view as a mirror, which images the mercy of the Lord to the greatest sinner in all succeeding times. This thought gives us the point of view from which we must always regard the most striking examples of Christ's power. The Lord works not only dynamically, but symbolically; and every new act of His might and love is a sign of what He will continually repeat in still higher measure.

2. The conversion of Paul is one of the highest revelations of the majesty and power of the Divine grace. We see in it a grace not only overpowering and searching, but forgiving, strengthening, and purifying. It is alike clear what are the natural and

insurmountable barriers in the reception of this grace; as where one sins wilfully, so that there remains no more offering for sin (Heb. x. 26). Had Paul had no ἄγνοια, his forgiveness would have been quite impossible, since, in that case, he would have committed a sin unto death (1 John v. 16, 17), by which the inward link of connection with the Divine mercy, salvation, and atonement would have been entirely wanting.

3. We find a self-revelation like this of Paul, on a larger basis, in the confessions of S. Augustin. It is worth our study, in an ethical view, to compare, with this feeling of personal unworthiness, the gross Pelagian self-conceit of Rousseau's confessions. It is this union of the deepest humility with the most unshaken faith, that unlocks the secret of such singular grandeur of character in Paul.

4. "Christ Jesus came into the world," &c.—a gospel within a gospel; as John iii. 16; 1 John iv. 9, 10, and several other places. Observe how simple the Apostle's confession of faith becomes, as he draws nearer to the close of life. In the great antithesis of sin and grace, all is finally resolved. The gospel a glad message for the lost; this is all, but this is enough. Here is exactly seen the accord, on one side, which the gospel finds, and, on the other, the discord against which it clashes.

5. As with Paul, so with many since, we see how the worst foes of the truth, after their conversion, have become its strongest witnesses. Thus, S. Augustin; later, John Newton; in the history of missions, Van der Kemp, and many others.—The natural cause and deep significance of this fact.

6. If the conversion of a single Paul called forth such a hymn of thanksgiving, how much louder will it resound when the kingdom of God is come, and all His wonderful ways for the redemption of the manifold millions are revealed before all saints.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

No higher ground of thanksgiving than for conversion to the truth.—The great contrast between the *once* and the *now* in the life of Paul. How far it must be repeated with every Christian.—The glory of the minister of the gospel whom the Lord has counted faithful, and has placed in office.—The difference between pardonable and unpardonable sin.—How far the ignorance of unbelief is self-condemned.—The conversion of Paul an evidence of the power of grace: (1.) No fall so deep that grace cannot descend to it; (2.) no height so lofty that grace cannot lift the sinner to it.—The inseparable union of grace on the side of the Lord, and of faith and love on the side of the sinner.—Faith and love no meritorious cause of grace, but only the means through which it is appropriated.—That "mercy has been given to me," the highest boast of faith.—What grace works in the sinner, before, in, and after his conversion.—In what way the Christian, after the pattern of Paul, must look back on his early errors: (1.) With thanksgiving for his redemption (ver. 12); (2.) with constant humility (vers. 13-15); (3.) with unshaken and steadfast faith; (4.) with glad glorifying of the Lord (ver. 17).—The great end of the manifestation of the Son of God in the world.—The gospel a glad message, which (1.) embraces all sinners; (2.) is worthy of all acceptance.—Paul a pattern of the deepest humility, united with the greatest faith.—"Of whom I am chief": (1.) How far can each one repeat this word for himself? (2.) why is this confession necessary? Without it, (*a*) there is no desire for redemption; (*b*) no delight in redemption; (*c*) no knowledge of the worth of redemption.—What can the greatest sinner learn for his encouragement and guidance from the pardoned Paul?—God the King of the ages: (1.) He sways them with His mighty will; (2.) He outlives them on His eternal throne.—The glorification of God the highest end of redemption.—The conversion of Paul a worthy subject for the glorifying of God on earth and in heaven (comp. Gal. i. 24).

"Of whom I am chief," a beautiful preparatory theme for the Holy Supper. "I have obtained mercy," an appropriate subject for the celebration of the Supper itself. "Now unto the King eternal," a fitting topic for the sermon of thanksgiving, where, as through Holland, it is preached after the celebration of the Supper. Ver. 12 specially suited for an ordination, or for a church festival.

Starke: Lange's *Op.:* In the work of our conversion, we must ascribe nothing to our own power, but all to God (Phil. ii. 13). Every teacher must be sure of his Divine call to the office (Acts xx. 28).—Although he who is justified knows that he has forgiveness of sins, still he regards that time of his life with a constant feeling of shame; yet this will be joined with a spirit childlike and resigned to the will of God.—Osiander: The grace of God is the richer and more abundant the greater our trans gressions have been, when we have repented truly and from the heart (Rom. v. 20).—As often as the example of a converted sinner is offered in the sacred Scriptures, our faith in the forgiveness of sins should be strengthened.—Is God an eternal King? We need not fear that tyrants will drive Him from the throne of His majesty. Since He cannot die, let us fly to Him in all our trials, and reflect, God still lives!—Heubner: Because Paul acted openly and sincerely as a persecutor, God accepted him. Here the saying of Johnson applies: "I love a good hater;" *i. e.*, I love one who, with true, frank conviction, is opposed to me.—Christianity is for sinners, not for the righteous.—The long-suffering forbearance of God toward the unbelieving.—What incalculable results may come from the conversion of a sinner!

Vers. 12-17. The Epistle for the seventh Sunday after Trinity, in the Grand Duchy of Hesse, and elsewhere: Beck: Mercy meets us as (1.) the ground; (2.) the way; (3.) the end.—Lindemann: How encouraging a faith is this faith in the mercy of God! It awakens us (1.) to sincere humility; (2.) to steadfast patience; (3.) to heartfelt repose; (4.) to a thankful joy.—Schmaltz: The blessedness of grace.—Alt: Man in his rejoicing over the gracious work of God.—Natorp: What deep cause we have to humble ourselves before God.—Ad. Monod: The signs of a true conversion shown in the example of Paul: (1.) What it is; (2.) what its purpose; (3.) how it originates. See his third sermon on Paul, in the introduction of the work already mentioned.

[Jeremy Taylor: This consideration St. Paul urged as a reason why God forgave him, because he did it ignorantly. For heresy is not an error of the understanding, but of the will. And this is clearly insinuated in Scripture, wherein faith and a good life are made one duty, and vice is called opposite to faith, and heresy opposed to holiness.—Bishop Hall: "To save sinners." Add, if thou wilt, "whereof I am chief." Thou canst say no worse of thyself than a better man said before thee, who, in the right of a sinner, claimed the benefit of a Saviour.—W.]

IV.

Paul exhorts Timothy to fight the good fight, and strengthens this exhortation by referring him to the falling away and condemnation of some, two of whom he mentions by name.

CH. I. 18–20.

18 This charge I commit unto thee, son Timothy, according to the prophecies
which went before on thee, that thou by [in] them mightest war[1] a good war-
19 fare; Holding faith and a good conscience; which some having put away con-
20 cerning faith have made shipwreck: Of whom is Hymeneus[2] and Alexander;
whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn [be taught] not to
blaspheme.

[1] Ver. 18.—[στρατεύῃ. *Recepta*, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Sinaiticus, στρατεύσῃ.—E. H.]
[2] Ver. 20.—[Sinaiticus, Ὑμένεος. But in 2 Tim. ii. 17 it has Ὑμέναιος—the commonly received spelling.—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 18. **This charge I commit unto thee,** παρατίθεμαι, *committo tibi;* yet not *ut auditoribus proponas* (Bengel); for it is obviously a precept for the official life and work of Timothy himself. Here the Apostle, after his more personal disclosure (vers. 5–17), returns to his original exhortation (vers. 3, 4), and again directly addresses Timothy, whom he has for awhile lost sight of. The question, what παραγγελία properly means, is differently answered by commentators. It seems best to seek the answer in the clause immediately following, ἵνα στρατ., κ.τ.λ., and thus to explain ἵνα as a particle referring to the object. Thus Matthies, De Wette, Wiesinger, Huther, and others. It is not so much a command, in the strict sense of the word, as a tender, fatherly counsel, that Timothy shall show himself a true soldier of Jesus Christ, and so fulfil the high expectations that were justly cherished concerning him. We notice here that Paul already employs military figures (Otto). Παραγγελία is used of a military command; XENOPHON, *Hell.* 11. Paul, in a Christian sense, assigns to Timothy the command against the heretics.—**According to the prophecies which went before on thee.** Heubner: "According to the good hopes which thou didst awaken in thy youth—hopes that wise, devout men expressed of thee, and likewise prophetically foretold, as Staupitz in the case of Luther." Instead of this superficial view, we have every reason to refer these words to the χάρισμα τῆς προφητείας in the Christian Church at the time of the Apostle, and to compare it with 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6. Prophesyings are here, as always in the New Testament, spoken of as the fruit of a supernatural influence of the Holy Ghost; and we can easily conceive that such utterances were not wanting at the solemn ordination of Timothy to the ministry of the Gospel. These prophesyings went before in him (προαγούσας ἐπί σε), preceding his entrance upon his Christian course; and Timothy would turn this hope to shame, if he shewed himself untrue to his calling. Ἐν αὐταῖς, in conformity to them. The view, that those prophesyings were the weapons which Timothy must put on for the conflict, seems too artificial, and not strictly Pauline; it is simpler to regard them as the rule which must determine his conduct, or, if we will, as the limits within which he must act.—**War a good warfare.** De Wette is too general: "That thou, in the conduct of thy office, demean thyself worthily and bravely." Far more happily Luther: "That thou therein do a knightly work." Στρατεία here does not mean the conflict of the Christian life in general, but the conflict as a leader in the church, which Timothy was to wage specially against the heretics of his day. It is a warfare, in a strict sense of the word, under the banner of the King of kings. For a correct understanding of the figurative expression, comp. 2 Cor. x. 4; Eph. vi. 10–18; 1 Thess. v. 8; 2 Tim. ii. 3, 5.—Chrysostom: διὰ τί καλεῖ στρατείαν τὸ πρᾶγμα; δηλῶν, ὅτι πόλεμος ἐγήγερται σφοδρὰς πᾶσι μὲν μάλιστα δὲ τῷ διδασκάλῳ.

Ver. 19. **Holding faith and a good conscience.** In the conflict which we wage outwardly against the enemy, our chief concern is with the inner state and disposition of the heart. Ἔχων is here to be taken in the sense of κατέχων, as the participial connective denotes the manner in which Timothy must follow the exhortation (ver. 18). That faith is here set forth as a weapon, as Eph. vi. 16 (according to Matthies), is improbable, on account of the inner connection of πίστιν and συνείδησιν ἀγαθήν. The Apostle simply means that Timothy shall guard both—that is, shall hold fast, and not renounce them. There is thus the same connection of faith and conscience here as in ver. 5. Unbelief is with the Apostle not theoretical, but practical—bound with the inward state of our moral life, as is shown by what immediately follows.—**Which some having put away,** &c. The sense is: through the defilement of a good conscience, some have lost not only this, but also the faith which they before possessed. Ἥν τινὲς ἀπωσάμενοι; which—*i. e.*, a good conscience—some have rejected, as a troublesome creditor whom they will be rid of at any cost.—**Have suffered shipwreck.** Ναυαγεῖν is a word used in Greek, Roman, and Hebrew writers, and common with us to denote severe, irrecoverable losses. It is only found in the New Testament, in its proper sense, in 2 Cor. ii. 25, and here in a figurative sense. Should it be thought that the image of a shipwreck had in the preceding ἀπωσάμενοι passed before the mind of Paul, then a good

conscience must be regarded not as the rudder (Mack), but as the anchor (Wiesinger), with whose loss the whole vessel is ruined. The proposition, *περὶ, c. accus.*, denotes especially what they had lost in the wreck. "*Metaphora a naufragio, sumpta aptissime quadrat, nam innuit, ut salva fides ad portum usque pervenit, navigationis nostræ cursum bona conscientia regendum esse, alias naufragii esse periculum, hoc est, ne fides mala conscientia tanquam gurgite in mari procelloso immergatur;*" Calvin.

Ver. 20. **Of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander.** *Hymeneus;* perhaps the same mentioned in 2 Tim. ii. 17. *Alexander;* probably not the same mentioned in 2 Tim. iv. 14 as ὁ χαλκεύς, since, in this case, the excommunication would have the appearance of personal revenge; perhaps we should refer it to the Ephesian named in Acts xix. 33, who, without doubt, was well enough known to Timothy. —**Whom I have delivered unto Satan.** The formal sentence of excommunication, by which any were separated from the church and given over to the powers of darkness which ruled in heathendom (Col. i. 13 and 1 Cor. v. 5). Here, as in the passages just cited, the Apostle seems to point mentally εἰς ὄλεθρ. τῆς σαρκός, as may be inferred from the following ἵνα παιδευθ., κ.τ.λ., which, however, should not be regarded as the effect of the ban of the church *per se*, but rather of a just, divine recompense. That the Apostle here speaks only of what he had done in his own mind (Planck, Matthies), is mere conjecture. The expression admits of no other explanation than that of a fact already completed, which he either for the first time disclosed to Timothy, or for good reasons mentioned again.—**That they may learn,** ἵνα παιδευθῶσι, with the added thought of the chastisement which, in the view of the Apostle, ought to restrain them from a repetition of the blasphemy which, without doubt, they had already uttered against God and Christ. "*Facto fidei naufragio, blasphemiæ periculum adest;*" Bengel. [The phrase here used may probably have been drawn from the formula of excommunication used in the apostolic church. Alford thinks the delivering to Satan "an apostolic act for the purpose of correction, which might or might not be accompanied by extrusion from the church," *Vide in loco.* But the solemn strength of the phrase seems hardly to admit the idea of a lesser penalty. The kingdoms of Christ and of Satan are conceived of as two opposites. Augustine well calls this discipline of excommunication, "*Medicinalis vindicta, terribilis lenitas, charitatis severitas.*" *Ad Liter. Petilian.* 3, 4.—W.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. As the life of the individual Christian is a constant warfare, so may the life of an upright minister of the gospel be specially regarded from this point of view; and above all, in the days when error lifts its head boldly and arrogantly, as in the time of Timothy. There is, however, a false lust for strife, as a false love of grace, against which the young minister of the word cannot be too earnestly warned. Striking suggestions as to the way in which he must wage the καλὴν στρατείαν, and guide his official life, may be found in the old, well-known work of J. Valentin Andreä, entitled, "The Good Life of a Righteous Servant of the Gospel," which is referred to by Herder, in his "Letters on the Study of Theology," and is still worthy of study. His contrast of the good and bad teacher ought not to be forgotten: "*Præceptor bonus ducit, dum malus trahit; lucet ille, hic offuscat; docet ille, hic confundit; regit ille, hic impellit; excitat ille, hic deprimit; oblectat ille, hic angit; format ille, hic destruit. Paucis dicam: nisi præceptor ipse liber, imo bibliotheca, et museum inambulans sit, nisi laboris breviarum et manubrium, nisi linguarum artiumque repertorium et formula, nisi insuper patriæ et ecclesiæ ornamentum audiat, non sapit ad ingenium nostrum. Nam libros repetere et exigere, ad laborem agere et stimulare, præcepta, regulas dictaque obtrudere, cujus vis est; summam rei monstrare, facilitatem aperire, applicationem adhibere, usum docere, exemplo praire, denique ad Christum omnia referre, hoc opus, hic sudor Christianus est, quem nullæ orbis opes rependerint.*" See Hagenbach's "Lectures on the History of the Reformation," *in loco.*

2. The Pauline conception of the inner relation of faith and conscience is of the highest significance. As unbelief nearly always leads either to grosser or more refined immorality, so not rarely it begins from an immoral ground, at least when faith existed before. This conception is thoroughly Pauline; comp. Rom. i. 21; and, again, our Lord's own view of it, John vii. 17. It is a deep mental truth; for it is far too common to represent faith or infidelity as a matter of abstract opinion. Gospel truth is no mere work of the understanding or the memory; the light of the gospel is life, and its work is power. It can only then be grasped, when knowledge and affection and volition are joined, so that the thought has root in the affections, and activity in the will; as, reversely, an action severed from Christian knowledge and affection can never be Christian. It would be interesting to study the history of heresies from this point of view, and to seek the deepest moral ground of the greatest errors. On the other hand, it is obvious that a conscientious, moral life, is essential to the stability of the life of faith. Compare the essay of Ed. Guder on "The Scriptural Doctrine of Conscience;" *Theol. Stud. und Kritik.*, 1857; Otto, p. 98.

3. What Paul says of Hymeneus and Alexander, shows us how highly he valued church discipline, and how much the looseness and indifference of many churches in this respect directly contradicts his spirit and example. Yet it should be noticed, that he only resorted to this in extreme cases, and then solely with the view to effect reformation by such punishment, and to save the soul from eternal harm. The inquisition of the Roman Church is thus as fully condemned here, as the indifference of many members of the evangelical church.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The Christian life, as well as that of every true minister of the gospel, a warfare.—Wo to the herald of the gospel who does not fulfil all that is justly expected of him.—Faith lost, all lost.—The inner connection of faith and conscience, of the religious and moral life.—The shipwreck of faith: (1.) How easily one can suffer shipwreck; (2.) how disastrous the end.—The sight of another's apostasy ought to lead us to greater diligence, to greater truth and watchfulness.—Ecclesiastical discipline: (1.) Its principle; (2.) its right; (3.) its purpose; (4.) its

mode; (5.) its limits.—Even the punishment of sin may be transformed into blessing.

Starke: Lange's *Op.:* Our spiritual strife does not cease, but lasts as long as we live, for our spiritual enemies never die.—What the eye is to the head, and the heart to the body, the conscience is to faith and to a complete Christianity.—It is very tender, and must therefore be well guarded.—It is not an unavoidable necessity that any should fall away from the grace of God, but rather it is possible and necessary to abide therein to the end (1 Cor. xv. 13).—Osiander: The departure of Hymeneus and Alexander from the pure doctrine, shows that some will always fall away, although the servants of the church fulfil their office truly (2 Cor. xi. 28). The Romish excommunication is different from the apostolic, as darkness from light; for it does not come from God, but is rather a work of Satan; not against the enemy, but to destroy the friends and witnesses of the truth (John xvi. 2, 3).—Heubner: The remembrance of the hopes of a former teacher is a great stimulus, an earnest call to be and to do what others have expected of us.—It is a grave truth: sinful life leads to unbelief; religion becomes doubtful; it is for our interest to doubt. Strive, then, earnestly to abide in communion with Christ.—Chastisements are healing messengers of God for the recovery of men.

V.

Exhortation to supplication for all men, especially for those in authority.

Ch. II. 1-7.

1 I exhort[1] therefore, that, first of all,[2] supplications, prayers, intercessions,
2 *and* giving of thanks [thanksgiving], be made for all men; For kings, and *for*
all that are in authority; [,] that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all
3 godliness and honesty.[3] For this *is* good and acceptable in the sight of God our
4 Saviour; Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge
5 of the truth. For *there is* one God, and one mediator between God and men,
6 the man Christ Jesus; [,] Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified[4] in
7 due time. [,] Whereunto [In respect of which] I am ordained a preacher, and
an apostle (I speak the truth in Christ,[5] *and* lie not) [I speak the truth in
Christ, I lie not]; a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity.

[1] Ver. 1.—[παρακαλῶ; παρακάλει, G.—evidently, as Huther says, a conjecture for the sake of giving to the Apostle's address to Timothy the form of a command.—E. H.]

[2] Ver. 1.—[πρῶτον πάντ.; not, at the beginning or opening of public service (C. and H. after Chrysostom), but "before all things"—as the author, who follows Huther, observes, the words are to be connected with παρακαλῶ.—E. H.]

[3] Ver. 2.—[σεμνότητι. If the English word *respectability* had not lost its meaning, it would perhaps be the proper word to express the sense of the Apostle here. *Dignity* is too stately. Vulgate: "*castitate*." Calvin: "*honestate*." C. and H.: "*gravity*." German Version: "*Ehrbarkeit*." The word means *an estate* or condition of *honor*, &c., founded upon the possession of the corresponding moral quality, honesty.—E. H.]

[4] Ver. 6.—[τὸ μαρτύριον; omitted by A., and rejected by Lachmann. It stands in the Sinaiticus without the article. In some MSS. οὗ was written before τὸ μαρ. The omission from A. is certainly singular. The sense is much better with than without the words. Tischendorf retains them. Huther says that Lachmann did; but this is a mistake—at least, they are not in the large edition of 1850.—E. H.]

[5] Ver. 7.—The words of the *Recepta*, ἐν Χριστῷ, are wanting in A. D.[1] F. G., and others, and for this reason have been left out by Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and others. Perhaps they were introduced from Rom. ix. 1. The Sinaiticus has retained them. [They are not in Murdock's Syriac Translation.—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **I exhort therefore, that, first of all.** There is not a marked connection between this and the former chapter, but the Apostle passes simply from the general command (ver. 18) to the special, and states at once what in his view is especially important. The whole of the second chapter contains precepts concerning the Christian Church. Vers. 1-7 declares for whom and on what ground public prayer ought to be made; vers. 8-15 how men and women should conduct themselves in this respect; and, indeed, the last portion is not without some more precise suggestions as to the calling of women in general.—**I exhort therefore,** παρακαλῶ. The Apostle now personally counsels Timothy what he must do to fight a good fight in his pastoral office, and what should be his first task in his relation to the church. Πρῶτον must not be joined with ποιεῖσθαι (Luther), but with παρακαλῶ; οὖν is here a connective, which joins the exhortation to vers. 18, 19, and was necessary on account of the digression in ver. 20. [The English Version reads: "*I exhort therefore, that, first of all.*" This reading is sustained by many expositors, as Luther, Calvin, Bengel, and later, among the English, Conybeare. But Alford adopts the same reading as is here given: "*I exhort first of all;*" so also Heydenreich, Matthies, Wiesinger, De Wette, Huther, Ellicott.—W.] The ground on which the Apostle chiefly urges these intercessions can be only probably determined. Perhaps, in time of persecution, they had been somewhat neglected, or were less earnestly conducted by the believers at Ephesus, after they had left their

first love (Rev. ii. 4); perhaps some persons had been excluded by party spirit, or by the want of unity. Whatever the reason, the Apostle exhorts that intercessions be made for all men—for mankind in its wholeness.—**Supplications, prayers, intercessions, the giving of thanks**; four words which mark the earnestness and comprehensiveness of all Christian petitions. In respect to the first three, the words of Calvin are of value: "*Neque tamen super vacanea est verborum congeries, sed mihi videtur Paulus consulto tres voces in eundem finem simul conjungere, ut precandi studium et assiduitatem magis commendet et vehementius urgeat.*" As to the meaning of the εὐχαριστία, the Apostle elsewhere teaches that Christian devotion, as is implied in its nature, must at all times be accompanied with thanksgiving (1 Thess. v. 17, 18; Col. iv. 2). The view that the Apostle in each of these words would designate a special kind of prayer, is as arbitrary as the opinion that this is a mere empty tautology. But since one and the same subject is here denoted by different words, we may at least attempt to reach a more exact definition. That arbitrary exegesis into which many earlier and later commentators have fallen, will be entirely avoided if we study the grammatical force of the language. Δέησις, from δέομαι, *egeo*, signifies generally a prayer which springs from the feeling of want; προσευχή, a petition, not without regard to whom it is offered, like the preceding word, but distinctly addressed to God; comp. Phil. iv. 6; ἔντευξις (from ἐντυγχάνω = *adeo aliquem*) means not intercession in and for itself (comp. chap. iv. 5), but here, where ὑπὲρ πάντ. ἀνθρ. follows, it signifies prayer offered not so much for our own needs, as on behalf of others; εὐχαριστία, finally, is thanksgiving joined with all before, both for preservation from evil, and for the good in which men rejoice. Those for whom all such prayers are made are not only Christians, but Jews and heathen likewise; and the whole exhortation, therefore, is opposed to an unchristian exclusiveness.

Ver. 2. **For kings, and for all that are in authority.** After this general injunction, some are named who need a special place in public prayers. There is no designation of Antonine and his associate rulers (Baur)—which, certainly, would be internal evidence of the spuriousness of the Epistle—but a general designation of the class, including the Roman emperor then or afterward living, and all under him invested with high office (comp. Rom. xiii. 1).—**That we may**; not a statement of the character of the prayer, but of its purpose; and this, too, not in the subjective, but objective view. The Apostle does not mean that the church should be influenced, through such petitions, to lead a quiet and peaceable life under authority; but he supposes that God, who guides the hearts of kings as the water-brooks (Prov. xxi. 1), will, in answer to the prayer of the church, move the hearts of kings, and of all in authority, to leave Christians at rest.—**A quiet and peaceable life.** No immoderate striving after the crown of martyrdom, but a quiet life to the glory of God, is the highest ideal. According to Olshausen, ἤρεμος denotes an inward, ἡσύχιος an outward rest; but others differ. It is most desirable that Christians should thus pass (διάγειν) their lives **in all godliness and honesty.** [The word rendered *honesty* should be *gravity*, according to Alford, Conybeare, and others. It should be remembered, however, that *honesty*, at the time of our English Version, came nearer than now to the idea of honorable or respectable, which lies at the root of σεμνότης.—W.] These last two words mark the sphere of the Christian life. Εὐσέβεια, a word which, with Paul, occurs only in the Pastoral Epistles, and denotes our disposition toward God; σεμνότης, an expression also peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles, refers to the outward relation of the Christian toward his fellow-men. Wiesinger justly remarks, from a manuscript note of Olshausen, that a strong light is thrown on this whole exhortation, when we recal the conduct of the Jews shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem. It had been already enjoined in the Old Testament that the Jews should pray for their Gentile rulers (comp. Jer. xxix. 7; Ezra vi. 10). The custom remained among them. Augustus ordered that a lamb should be offered for him daily in the temple; and, until the destruction of Jerusalem, this usage lasted; but the Zealots regarded it as a Divine worship, and demanded that the offering should cease. JOSEPH., *De Bello Jud.* ii. 17. [This injunction of St. Paul became the rule of the early church; and it is interesting to trace it in the prayers for kings found in almost all the primitive liturgies. *Liturgia Basilii*, GOAR, *Rit. Græc.*, pp. 171, 178; *Liturgia Marci*, RENAUDOT, *Lit. Orient.*, tom. 1, p. 133; *Miss. Sarisb. Missa pro Rege*, *Lit. Gall c.*, MABILLON, p. 246. Chrysostom informs us that it was the custom, in his day, to offer daily prayers for kings and all in authority. *Hom.* 6 *in* 1 *Tim.* The prayers for the royal family, in the English Version, although they do not appear to have been translated from any very ancient offices, are yet, in substance and expression, conformed to the primitive. See PALMER, *Orig. Liturg.* We have here the true reverence of law which Christianity teaches. But we are never to confound this, or like maxims—*e. g.*, Rom. xiii. 1—with any theory of the divine right of kings, or with "passive obedience" to any tyranny, as has been done by some divines. The political duty of men in a Christian state cannot be the same with that of the primitive church under a Nero.—W.]

Ver. 3. **For this is good and acceptable**; τοῦτο sc. ποιεῖσθαι ἐντεύξ. The Apostle now adds various motives (vers. 3–7) toward obeying the exhortation given in vers. 1, 2. The first is, that every such prayer is good in and for itself, καλόν; it shows the true Christian spirit which marks the professor of the gospel; it yields us the enjoyment of that privilege named in ver. 2. It is again, as a second motive, ἀπόδεκτον ἐνώπιον τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ. This is God's will; it befits His desire and purpose; it is already expressed in the name σωτήρ, and this appears clearly from the following (vers. 4, 5). Our Saviour wills that all should be saved; and thus we pray for all, as the objects of His gracious will.

Ver. 4. **Who will have all men to be saved.** Paul teaches not only here, but in other places (comp. Rom. viii. 32; xi. 32; Titus ii. 11), that the desire of God to bless all sinners is unlimited, yet it can be only in the ordained way of faith. And here, perhaps, he affirms it, in order to maintain this doctrine plainly against every Gnostic limitation of salvation, as well as to give a fit motive for prayer. For, had God willed the contrary of what is here revealed, it would be foolish and fruitless to pray for the welfare of others, when perhaps this or that person might be shut out from the plan of salvation. Yet more, the Apostle speaks here of the θέλειν of God in general, not of the βούλημα, which regards believers (Eph. i. 11). It is therefore entirely needless, by any exegetical gloss, to limit the expression,

all men, or to understand πάντας ἀνθρ. in the sense of all classes of men (which would make ver. 1 an absurdity).—**Unto the knowledge of the truth**; properly, not all truth, not even all religious truth in general, but Christian truth. This added clause explains through what means the σωθῆναι of all men must be wrought.

Ver. 5. **For there is one God . . . the man Christ Jesus.** The ground of the general redemptive plan of God is here so shown (γάρ) as to give a third motive in justification of Christian intercessions; the unity of person whence the plan of universal salvation has gone forth, and through whom it is completed. The unity of God, which the Apostle clearly declares in other places (Rom. iii. 29, 30; 1 Cor. viii. 4; Eph. iv. 6), is here placed distinctly in the foreground, to show how arbitrary is any limit of Christian intercession; the unity of the Mediator, to prove that the Jew has not the least advantage over the heathen, since both must be saved in one and the same way. Μεσίτης, He who stands between God and man, in order to effect a new union (comp. Gal. iii. 20): "*inter Deum atque homines medius constitutus;*" Tertullianus. When Paul calls Him, finally, with special emphasis, the man Christ Jesus, it is not absolutely necessary to infer that he was opposing the heresy of Docetism (Huther), although such a purpose is quite possible and probable, when we think how early the real manhood of the Lord was doubted (1 John iv. 3), and what high dignity the first Gnostics ascribed to Æons and to angels. The thought, too, is genuinely Pauline (see Rom. v. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 31; Phil. ii. 7, 8; Heb. ii. 16, 17), and it is most fitting in this place, since the Lord, had He not been real man, could not have been also μεσίτης; while, again, the ἀνθρώπων just before called out almost involuntarily this emphatic ἄνθρωπος.

Ver. 6. **Who gave himself.** This expresses the mode in which the Mediator has fulfilled His office, and the universality of the redemptive plan. *Has given*, δούς, comp. Gal. i. 4; Titus ii. 14. The voluntary character of the offering of the Lord is here, as often before, set forth by the Apostle; and although he does not speak in express words of this sacrifice in his death, yet it follows from the very purpose of the Mediator to give a ransom for all; since the price of redemption could be nothing less than Himself, His blood, and life. Ἀντίλυτρον, somewhat stronger yet than the usual λύτρον (Matt. xx. 28), since the idea of an exchange, which lies in the substantive itself, gains special force from the preposition (Matthies). In connection with ἀντίλυτρον, ὑπέρ is not, in this place at least, simply to be understood *in commodum* (Huther), but here the idea of substitution must be firmly held. This one ransom weighs more than all the souls in whose place it is reckoned; and here, too, these souls are spoken of as πάντες. See further under Doctrinal and Ethical thoughts. [It appears by no means just, either on exegetical or doctrinal grounds, to draw the idea of substitution from this passage. The phrase ἀντίλυτρον simply includes the meaning of satisfaction, freedom purchased by a sufficient ransom. Undoubtedly the truth of a vicarious sacrifice in its living sense, Christ in us and we in Him, is the blessed truth of the word of God. But it has been the vice of theology always to lower this holy mystery of a Divine love and sacrifice to a commercial contract. The *cur Deus homo* of Anselm cannot explain that mystery so truly to the Christian reason or heart, as the few words of St. John the Divine: "God is love. God so loved the world, that He gave His only-begotten Son." And it may be well for any who read this image of St. Paul, to weigh the following profound sentence of Coleridge: "Forgiveness of sin, the abolition of guilt, through the redemptive power of Christ's love, and of His perfect obedience, is expressed, on account of the resemblance of the consequence in both cases, by the payment of a debt for another, which debt the payer had not himself incurred. Now the impropriation of this metaphor (*i. e.*, the taking it literally), by transferring the sameness from the consequents to the antecedents, or inferring the identity of the causes from a resemblance in the effects, this view or scheme of redemption, grounded on this confession, I believe to be altogether unscriptural;" "Aids to Reflection, Aphor. 19, on Spirit. Relig."—W.]—**To be testified in due time**; τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίοις. Luther: "That it should be preached in his own time;" Vulgata: "*cujus testimonium temporibus suis confirmatum est.*" Chrysostom, and other Church fathers, incorrectly understand the suffering and death of the Lord as itself the μαρτύριον. But the idea (Huther) that the reference is to the preaching of the gospel, which has now been sent at a fitting time, seems alike arbitrary, since in this case the beginning of ver. 7 sinks almost to flat tautology. We think, rather, that μαρτύριον should here be held in apposition to ἀντίλυτρον; to wit, that the Apostle calls this sacrifice of the Lord in death for our ransom the great μαρτύριον; the witness of the truth stated in ver. 4, which is raised above all doubt through this blessed revelation of grace. Since this offering is made, there cannot be any further question whether God wills the salvation *of all*. The Apostle does not speak of a testimony which he is the first to affirm, but one to which God has given witness already in His Son; and in ver. 7 he first alludes to his own personal connection with it. "*Innuitur testimonium redemtionis universalis;*" Bengel.—**In due time**, καιροῖς ἰδίοις; that is, in the time foreordained by God, and for this reason most fitting; in other words, in the πλήρωμα τ. καιροῦ (Gal. iv. 4); comp. 1 Tim. vi. 15; Acts xvii. 26; Titus i. 2.

Ver. 7. **Whereunto I am ordained.** Εἰς ὅ, *ad quod* (*testimonium, sc. annunciandum*); another remembrance of his apostolic calling and dignity, as chap. i. 12. Paul points to the universal character of his calling, as proof of the universality of Divine grace; and this again as the great motive to pray for all.—**A preacher**; this general design of his calling is denoted by a name suited to all messengers of the gospel, and precedes the specific official title, ἀπόστολος.—**I speak the truth**, &c. (comp. Rom. ix. 1). A solemn adjuration, which, in view of so weighty a matter, and the many personal misjudgments concerning Paul, is quite appropriate here, and may well awaken confidence, not distrust. Although this digression has no logical force, it agrees well with a friendly, confiding letter like this, where his heart speaks in the most artless manner.—**A teacher of the Gentiles.** A more exact statement of the special sphere in which he is called to the work of his apostolic office. This mention of his peculiar gift lends new force to his exhortation to pray for all men.—**In faith and in verity.** Not only in true faith (Heydenreich, Mack, De Wette), but both conceptions are to be closely distinguished. Faith (a noteworthy variation, ἐν πνεύματι), means

faith in Christ, which is the great personal motive in the life of the Apostle; truth, that objective Christian truth itself, which is known and received by faith. The preposition ἐν seems, as often, to denote the means whereby the Apostle sought to reach the appointed end. That the words are to be taken as a formal assertion, like ἀλήθ. λέγω (ver. 6), is not probable.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The doctrine of Christian intercession, which the Apostle teaches with such heartfelt power, breathes the whole spirit of Christianity. The Lord Himself commended it, even for our enemies (Matt. v. 44). Thus, too, James, who was so fully quickened by the spirit of his glorified Master (James v. 16); and it is evident how strongly, and how often, Paul enjoins the intercession of the brethren. That the early Christians likewise earnestly kept this apostolic precept, and, even amidst the worst persecutions, did not cease to pray for kings and for those in authority, is clear from the early liturgies, as well as the testimony of apologists and church fathers. Thus, *e. g.*, TERTULLIAN, *Apol., cap.* 30: "*Manibus expansis oramus pro omnibus imperatoribus vitam illis prolixam, imperium securum, domum tutam, exercitus fortes, senatum fidelem, populum probum, orbem quietum, et quæcumque hominis et Cæsaris vota sunt.*" And POLYCARP, *ad Philipp., cap.* 12, says: "*Pro omnibus sanctis orate. Orate etiam pro regibus, et potestatibus et principibus, atque pro persequentibus et odientibus vos, et pro inimicis crucis, ut fructus vester manifestus sit in omnibus, ut sitis in illo perfecti.*" With this practice of Christian prayer, the Apostle exhorts believers to lead a quiet and holy life; and in this he shows his confidence, that such prayer for the community will obtain a blessing from God;—an unreasonable hope, if he speaks only of an influence on our own minds, not a supernatural power in prayer. This injunction is thus an indirect proof that there is not only a subjective, but also an objective connection, granted and assured of God, between prayer and its effects.

2. According to the express teaching of the Apostle, Christianity is the great instrument of salvation for all men. If the word ἐκκλησία is rightly understood, the saying, *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, has a sound sense. The right of Christian missionary work is grounded in this faith. The universality of God's plan of redemption is the mightiest spur of that Christian humanity which embraces all men. It is impossible, therefore, to be truly human, if one is not truly Christian; and it is alike contradictory to profess ourselves truly Christian, without being human.

3. "God wills that all men should be saved." It is a sorry dogmatism which would weaken the proof given in this passage for the universality of the plan of redemption, by exegetical arts; *e. g.*, when any seek to explain *will* in the absurd sense of desire; or *all men* in the sense of all classes—as Calvin and others have here done. Exegetical honesty forbids us to find in this place less than what is said, in other words, in 1 Tim. iv. 10 and 2 Pet. iii. 9. The inevitable necessity of an ἀποκατάστασις πάντων, from the fact that at some time, sooner or later, what God wills must be fulfilled, does not follow, however, from this position. The will of God here spoken of is not absolute, but conditional; *i. e.*, God wills that all men be saved by means of faith; but as faith, on the one side, is a gift of grace, so, on the other, it is a duty, whose neglect deserves punishment, and unbelief is a guilt that must have its reckoning. Against such views of Universalism we urge also, in their full force, the many positive expressions which set forth the eternal blessedness of believers, as grounded in the free decisions of God, and His grace in Christ. True wisdom lies not in sacrificing one series of these conceptions to the other, but in holding both with equal strength, since the unity of the seeming contradictions must be always a problem for Christian philosophy. These apostolic expressions, finally, give the fullest right to the freest, most unlimited, and powerful announcement of the gospel, while it must be left to God to show us the perfection of His purposes, and to justify them before our eyes. [It is the error of every theological system like that here alluded to, that it does not take its starting point from the moral facts of the Christian consciousness, but from the abstract idea of the Divine will. The iron chain of its logic must therefore end in a fatalism, which excludes all moral conditions based on the free choice of man. Such a premise may end in the dogma of absolute decrees and limited atonement; or it may equally lead to Universalism. If the will of God be irrespective of human action, there can be no limit to His grace. Or, again, if it be a logic within the circle of purely speculative ideas, it will end in the Pantheism of Spinoza; in an impersonal substance, of which all human actions are only phenomena, without any moral quality of good or evil. All these are forms of the same ground error. A Christian theology begins with the facts of our personal being, of sin and responsibility, and thence reasons to the character of God. The sentence of HOOKER, B. 1, c. 2, is profound: "They err, who think that of the will of God to do this or that, there is no reason besides His will." And this of CUDWORTH, *Serm. I.*, breathes the heart of the gospel: "It is the sweetest flower in all the garland of His attributes, that He is mighty to save; and this is far more magnificent for Him than to be styled mighty to destroy. For that, except it be in a way of justice, speaks no power at all, but mere impotency; for the root of all power is goodness."—W.]

4. If the death of the Saviour is revealed as a ransom for all, it is most important to distinguish between the power of His death, which is great enough to effect the redemption of all, and the fruit of His death, which is shared only by the believing and regenerate. As to the first point, the words of Augustin are weighty; *Sermo* 114, *de tempore*: "*Unâ morte universum mundum, sicut omnium conditor, ita omnium reparator, absolvit: indubitanter enim credimus, quod totum mundum redemit, qui plus dedit, quam totus mundus valeret.*" The other point is met by the words of the Saviour: "The good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep;" and again: "I pray not for the world, but for those whom thou hast given me;" John x. and xvii.

5. According to the express doctrine of our Apostle, the mediatorial office of the man Christ Jesus is not only the cardinal truth of Christianity, but the *conditio sine quâ non* of the eternal salvation of man. The existence of the only God would be, indeed, no glad message for fallen man, did he not hear also of a Mediator between God and man. In contrast to this soteriological doctrine of the Apostle, the boldness of many at this day is strange

indeed, who assert that they need no Mediator, but that man can go directly to the Father without the Son. Such men lack above all the living knowledge of the desert of sin, and the holiness of God. The God whom they approach is not the God revealed in the Scriptures, but rather the idol of their own darkened understanding.

[We may fitly append here a passage from ARCHBISHOP TRENCH'S "Sermons," which sets forth the living view of the mediatorial sacrifice, as it is distinguished alike from any forensic theory of imputation, and any denial of it on moral grounds. "Could God be well-pleased with the sufferings of the innocent and holy? What satisfaction could He find in these? Assuredly not: but he could have pleasure—nay, according to the moral necessities of His own being, he must have the highest joy, satisfaction, and delight—in the love, the patience, the obedience, which those sufferings gave Him the opportunity of displaying. . . . Nor was it, as some among the schoolmen taught, that God arbitrarily ascribed and imputed to Christ's obedience unto death a value which made it equal to the needs and sins of the whole world. We affirm rather with the deeper theologians of those and all times, who crave to deal with realities, not ascriptions and imputations, that His offering had in itself this intrinsic value. . . . Christ satisfied herein, not the Divine anger, but the Divine craving after a perfect holiness, righteousness, and obedience in man."—W.]

6. Against all Docetist tendencies which now and then appear in the church, the Apostle's assertion of the real manhood of Christ has always the deepest significance. There is among the strong defenders of the divinity of the Son far more Crypto-Docetism, far more fear of allowing the full and undiminished truth of Christ's humanity, than they themselves know. On the other side, it is much to be wished that all who rightly hold the ἄνθρωπος 'I. Χρ., could as readily accept what the Apostle further says in the Pastoral Epistles, in respect to the divinity of the Lord; see 1 Tim. iii. 16; Titus ii. 13. The very Docetism so early visible in the apostolic age, is an indirect proof of the superhuman character of the Saviour. His appearance was so wonderful, that men could not at first believe Him to be real man.

7. "Christianity knits the ties by which natural religion binds men to one God still more closely, through the one only Mediator; for He points to the one centre of all. Christ is the bond of the Godhead and manhood;" Heubner.

8. The apostolic command to pray for all men has been often interpreted as allowing prayers for the dead. The words of Luther are noteworthy on this subject, *Kirchenpostille*, *Dom. I.*, *Post Trin.*: "We have no command from God to pray for the dead, therefore no one can sin who does not pray for them. For, in what God has neither commanded nor forbidden, no man can sin. Yet, because God has not granted us to know the state of the soul, and we must be uncertain whether it has not met already its final doom, and therefore cannot tell if the soul be condemned, it is no sin that thou prayest for the dead; but in such wise, that thou leave it in doubt, and say thus: 'Dear God, if this soul be in that state that Thou yet mayest help it, I pray Thee to be gracious unto it.' For God has promised to hear us in what we ask. Therefore, if thou hast prayed once, or thrice, thou shouldest believe that thou art heard, and pray no more, lest thou tempt God."

9. If we have, according to the doctrine of the Apostle, only one Mediator between God and man, then the invocation of saints, and Mariolatry especially, as practiced in the Roman Church in recent times, is already condemned in its very principle.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Public prayer no secondary thing, but the chief element in the assembly of believers.—The duty of special intercession: (1.) Its extent (ii. 1, 2); (2.) its ground (ii. 3-7).—To pray for others: (1.) Its intrinsic worth; (2.) how seldom and poorly performed.—The relation of Christian subjects toward their rulers.—The influence of religious life and prayer on the welfare of the Church.—God wills that all men be saved: (1.) No mere show or pretence of will, but a right earnest will; (2.) no inactive will, but mighty, and working for the good of all; (3.) no absolute and despotic will, but a conditioned and holy will, against which the stiff-necked enmity of unbelief can hold out to its own eternal shame.—The knowledge of the truth, the Divine means for the eternal redemption of the sinner.—One Mediator for all: (1.) What a privilege to know Him! (2.) what a curse to reject Him! (3.) what a duty, after man has found Him, to make Him known to others also!—The high significance of the true manhood of the Lord. Without it, (1.) There is no perfect revelation of God in Christ; (2.) there is no true reconciliation of the Divine and the human, in and through Christ.—Christ the ransom for all: (1.) From what; (2.) for what; (3.) to what the Christian is thus redeemed.—The manifestation of Christ the pivot of the world's history.—God's time is always the best.—As Paul, so every minister of the Gospel must be assured of his Divine calling.—Faith and truth the great means to bring others to a knowledge of the gospel.—Missions to the heathen a continuation of the work of Paul.

STARKE: OSIANDER: Christians ought not only to pray for those who, like them, profess some sort of religion, but for all men, that God will guide their hearts to the gospel of Christ.—LANGE'S *Opp.*: There is in intercession for others the purest exercise of love for others.—One of the best and most valuable kinds of tax which we owe and may pay to our rulers, is to pray for them, and to thank God heartily for the good we receive through them.—ANTON: Prayer is a real Noah's ark, in which we may shut ourselves amidst threatening floods.—We cannot else pass through the tossing world (Luke xviii. 7, 8).—*Bibl. Würt.*: If God is minded to bring all men to the knowledge of the truth, who do not wilfully shut their eyes to it; if Christ has given Himself in death for all, that they may be kept from eternal ruin, we ought also, as holy children, to follow this example of God and Christ, gladly encourage all to seek their eternal health and salvation, and omit nothing which may aid toward it (Rom. x. 1).—LANGE'S *Opp.*: How can the Christian religion be other than true, since it leads to the knowledge of saving truths, while all other truths are only phantoms?—If it be the earnest will of God to save all men, none can excuse himself who remains godless and unbelieving.—Since the satisfaction of Christ is the masterwork and centre of the gospel, it must be chiefly urged by all teachers, and most

fully embraced and believingly applied by all hearers (1 Cor. i. 23; Gal. ii. 20).—OSIANDER: The gospel of Christ belongs to the Gentiles also (Isa. xlix. 6).—HEUBNER: Common prayer is a means of uniting hearts, a true bond of the Church.—Where the best Christians are, there are the best citizens.—Polytheism severs nations; Christianity binds all in one.—An angel could not be the Reconciler of the world.—All perfect virtue is self-sacrifice, a denial of my personal self, just as every ungodly life is egoism.—Christian integrity speaks truth.—LISCO: The duty of common prayer.—Intercession a work of love.—The greatest thought, the noblest deed, and the holiest decision.

Vers. 1–6. Epistle for Rogation day, in the Grand Duchy of Hesse and elsewhere.—BECK: Intercession, the consecration of a life of prayer.—Intercession the crown of prayer.—KNIPPENBERG: On the right spirit of Christian intercession.—DRÄSEKE: Christian intercession considered, (1.) In its nature; (2.) in its dignity; (3.) in its effects.—DIETZSCH: The wish of a Christian people for the welfare of its rulers.—W. HOFACKER: Of the right priestly spirit, as the need of our time.

VI.

By whom and how Prayer is to be made, and how especially women should conduct themselves in that respect.

CH. II. 8–15.

8 I will therefore that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands, without
9 wrath and doubting.[1] In like manner also, that women[2] adorn themselves in
modest apparel, with shame-facedness [shamefastness] and sobriety; [,] not with
10 braided [plaited] hair, or [and?] gold,[3] or pearls, or costly array; [,] But
(which becometh women professing godliness) with good works [by means of
11 *their* good works]. Let the women learn in silence [tranquilly] with [in]
12 all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach,[4] nor to usurp authority
13 over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve.
14 And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived[5] was in the
15 transgression. Notwithstanding [But] she shall be saved in child-bearing, if
they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.

[1] Ver. 8.—[*διαλογισμοῦ*. Sinaiticus, *διαλογισμοῦ*. Griesbach, *μοῦ*, in text; *μῶν*, in margin. Tischendorf, *διαλογισμῶν*. The singular form, being the more unusual, is probably the true reading.—E. H.]

[2] Ver. 9.—[*ὡσαύτως κ. τὰς γυν*. Lachmann, *ὡσαύτως γυναῖκας*; so also the Sinaiticus. Tischendorf, *ὡσαύτ. κ. γυναῖκας*.—E. H.]

[3] Ver. 9.—[*ἢ χρυσῷ*; Tischendorf, *καὶ χρυσῷ*. Sinaiticus the same. Lachmann, A. G., *καὶ χρυσίῳ*.—E. H.]

[4] Ver. 12.—[*γυναικὶ δὲ διδάσκειν*. Lachmann (A. D. G.) has *διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ*; so also the Sinaiticus. Tischendorf has retained the order of the words in the *Recepta*.—E. H.]

[5] Ver. 14.—[*ἀπατηθεῖσα*. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Sinaiticus, *ἐξαπατηθεῖσα*. The authorities are consentient here.—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 8. **I will therefore,** &c. *Βούλομαι οὖν*. *Βούλεσθαι* is stronger than *θέλειν*; it is to ordain, by the power of his apostolic authority; *οὖν* connects the following exhortation with vers. 1–3, and is needed on account of the brief digression in vers. 4–7. As the Apostle thus reverts to the public prayers just commended, he now states more exactly when, how, and through whom these should be conducted; and with this he adds his special counsel to the women as well as the men. The latter, in express distinction from the women, are alone to direct public prayers. It thus appears that, in the assembly of believers, this duty was not given exclusively to the presiding officer, but was performed without limitation by the members of the church. The Apostle does not object to this, but only orders that the women shall abstain entirely from it, which, perhaps, in more recent times, they had not always done.—**Everywhere.** Not only to be joined with *προσεύχεσθαι*, but with the whole proposition; in which it is further taught both that men ought, and how they ought to pray everywhere. The somewhat singular phrase, *ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ*, is surely not a designed contrast to the Jewish localism, which held the temple or the synagogue almost exclusively as the fit place for prayer, but is probably explained by the fact that the Ephesian church, like many others, consisted of different *ἐκκλησίαι κατ' οἶκον*, and thus had several places of meeting. Perhaps, also, in these different circles, the same customs were not in use; or some held one place holier than others. In view of this, the Apostle gives a precept which is to be remembered by all *ubi cumque sint*.—**Lifting up holy hands;** a Jewish custom, not only in taking an oath, or in benediction, but especially in prayer (see Ps. xxviii. 2; lxiii. 5); and, as appears from this passage, a usage of the Christian church; comp. *Clem. Rom. ad Corinth, cap.* 29.—**Holy hands;** such as are not stained with wilful sin, in contrast with the unclean hands of an evil-doer (Ps. xxiv. 4; xxvi. 6; comp. James iv. 8). In regard to the form, *ὁσίους χεῖρ*. (instead of *ὁσίας*, as some Codd. really have it), comp. WINER, *Gramm.*, 6th ed., p. 64.—**Without wrath,** &c. Without wrath and

contention. Luther less accurately says, *ohne Zorn und Zweifel.* The latter, contention, is the outward expression of the former. The Apostle refers directly to the wrath and contention of believers among themselves—it may be in questions of religious dispute, or other outbreaks in daily life. It is most probable that such disturbances had happened at their meetings in Ephesus, or, in the judgment of the Apostle, were to be feared. [The English Version and that of Luther are the same. Alford renders "without wrath and disputation;" that is, in tranquillity and mutual peace. Wordsworth renders, "without doubting or disputing." But see Ellicott.—W.]

Ver. 9. **In like manner also, that women.** At the opening of this verse, Βούλομαι must be anew supplied from the preceding; in the remainder, however, the construction is difficult and involved. It seems best, after γυναῖκας, to supply, not προσεύχεσθαι, but προσευχομένας, since the ὡσαύτως forbids the supposition that the Apostle has now closed the subject of public prayer in order to give a general rule as to the dress and attire of the women. It is more likely that Paul now passes on to the conduct of the women in the church, since they are not included in the preceding exhortation, having no right of speech in public prayers. They must appear in modest attire; καταστολή = ἔνδυμα; περιβολή = σχῆμα σώματος. Κόσμιος = πρέπουσα γυναιξὶν ἐπαγγελλομέναις τὴν θεοσέβειαν (ver. 10). The object of the Apostle is not to enjoin a general rule of life for Christian women, but specially for their demeanor at the place of prayer. He does not forbid all ornament, but only the excess which is a mark of frivolity and love of display, and awakens impure passions. They should adorn themselves, but with bashfulness and modesty (Luther: "with shame and modesty"). Both expressions refer not alone to the outward garment, but more to the inward spirit befitting the modest dress. Αἰδώς expresses the inward aversion from everything unseemly; σωφροσύνη, the control of the passions (Huther). This is the only ornament allowed to Christian women at public prayer. [*Shamefastness;* not, as in modern reprints of the English Version, *shamefacedness;* see TRENCH, *N. T. Synonymes.* This is an early Saxon form, which has unhappily become obsolete in this case. Wordsworth, however, is surely wrong when he calls it a word akin to *steadfastness.* It is to be found in the original edition of the Version of 1611.—W.]—**Not with braided hair,** πλέγμα, *insinuati multiplices in orbe crines;* but the general sense of a head-dress, or dress of the hair, should not be lost (comp. 1 Pet. iii. 5; Isa. iii. 24). These braidings of the hair are put first, but the following substantives denote the dress—ornaments of gold, whether bracelets, rings, or chains, pearls, or costly clothing, πολυτελής, nearly the same as in Matt. xi. 8, μαλακὰ ἱμάτια, and in Luke vii. 25, ἱματισμὸς ἔνδοξος. Compare with this whole precept the Divine denunciation of female luxury (Isa. iii.), and like passages in the Church fathers; *e. g.*, TERTULLIAN, *De Fœmineo Cultu.* "*Vestite vos serico probitatis, bysso sanctitatis, purpura pudicitiæ.*" AUGUSTIN, *Epit.* 73: "*Verus ornatus, maxime Christianorum et Christianarum, non tantum nullus mendax fucus, verum ne auri quidem vestisque pompa, sed mores boni sunt.*" Compare the remarkable "Eulogy of Seneca," *ad Helv. cap.* 6.

Ver. 10. **But what becometh.** The main clause must here be distinguished from the subordinate clauses. The chief proposition is that in which the Apostle states what is the true ornament of a devout woman. I will, he says, that they **adorn themselves with good works.** Good works, on the occasion of their public worship, can scarcely be any other than offerings of love for the poor, as Heydenreich has remarked; which, however, Huther without reason calls wholly arbitrary. Why should not this be styled the true ornament of a Christian woman, that, like Dorcas, she is full of good works and alms deeds? "*Si operibus testanda est pietas, in vestitu etiam casto apparere hæc professio debet;*" Calvin. The words, **which becometh,** &c., we regard not as a parænetic clause, which would offer great difficulty, but as defining the reason of Paul's praise of such an ornament, ὅ = καθ' ὅ = ὡς πρέπει. This dress, from his point of view, is the only becoming one.—**Professing godliness,** ἐπαγγελλ. θεοσ.; an expression peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles. Luther: *die Gottseligkeit beweisen;* French: *qui font profession de piété;* Dutch: *die godvruchtigheid belijden.* Ἐπαγγελλ., who glory in something, or lay claim to something, or will pass for something, or who employ themselves in something. Compare the Horatian "*quæ medicorum sint, profiteri.*" In this meaning of the verb, in this place, it is so much the less advisable to connect it with the following words, δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν.

Ver. 11. **Let the women learn in silence with all subjection.** Although the following counsels of the Apostle may readily be referred to the general relations of the sexes, still the connection requires us to regard them as here aimed at public teaching by women. Not the *docere,* but the *discere;* not prominence in outward rank, but the ὑποταγή in the place of prayer, is their proper calling. It appears that the Christian women at Ephesus were inclined to put themselves forward more than became them. The Apostle therefore enjoins silence upon them; and in the Jewish synagogues likewise, whose order was followed by the Christian assemblies, it was the rule that women should hear, but not speak (comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 34, and *Constel. App.* iii. *cap.* 6). Thus TERTULLIAN wrote, *De Virg. Vel., cap.* 9: "*Non permittitur mulieri in ecclesia loqui, nec docere, nec tinguere, nec ullius virilis muneris, nedum sacerdotalis officii sortem, sibi vindicare.*"—Ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ; the women, without uttering a word, are humbly and believingly to hear the instruction, which is given solely by men, in the holy place.

Ver. 12. **But I suffer not a woman,** &c. The parallel is so complete between vers. 11 and 12, that we can refer this verse to nothing save public instruction. Not any general authority of the wife over her husband is here forbidden—although the Apostle without doubt opposes this—but especially the assuming such superiority in the church. Even to ask concerning what she does not understand, is not allowed to a woman in public (1 Cor. xiv. 35), but only in her own house. Αὐθεντεῖν, in the earlier Greek, is equivalent to αὐτοχειρίζειν; in the later, to ἐξουσιάζειν. Ἀνδρός; the remark of Bengel is excellent: "*Id non tantum maritum notat, sed totum genus virorum.*"—**To be in silence.** Εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ; not only *tacere,* but still more, *in silentio versari;* so that silence is almost the distinct sphere assigned to woman in such circumstances. We have an instance, however, of διδάσκειν on the part of a woman in Acts xviii. 26, which the Apostle certainly

would not have forbidden. Finally, the Apostle supports this rule of silence on two grounds, which are both taken from the book of Genesis.

Ver. 13. **For Adam . . . then Eve** (comp. Gen. ii. 7, 18–23). Just as, in 1 Cor. xi. 8, the Apostle refers to the priority of Adam's creation, and thence infers the dependence of Eve in birth and condition; and, in her, of all women. Not always, indeed, yet here the priority warrants the superiority. "The Old Testament narration, as the Scriptures in general, is held by the Apostle as a holy, spiritual utterance of Divine truth; Adam and Eve are prototypes for all humanity of the manly and womanly nature; and in the creation of the primeval pair is the real ground of the law, that the woman must not teach, and, yet more, not be desirous to rule;" Matthies.

Ver. 14. **And Adam was not,** &c. (comp. Gen. iii. 1). A second ground, directly connected with the preceding. In ver. 13 it was stated why no authority was given to woman over man; in ver. 14, why she is justly forbidden to teach. "*Deceptio indicat minus robur in intellectu, atque hic nervus est, cur mulieri non liceat docere;*" Bengel. It is true that Adam also was misled, yet by means of the woman; but she was deceived in the strongest sense of the word, and she alone. She allowed herself to be enticed by the treacherous speech of the serpent, while Adam simply accepted the fruit from her hand. This passage does not conflict with Rom. v. 12, since Adam is there named as the head of sinful humanity, without reference to Eve; while here St. Paul regards the origin of sin as given in the Jewish narrative, which, in 2 Cor. ii. 3, also is ascribed to Eve. With Adam, then, was a simple παράβασις; with Eve, ἀπάτη and παράβασις together. Adam was therefore in the transgression, in the state of disobedience to the positive command of God. The reading ἐξαπατηθεῖσα, defended by Lachmann and Tischendorf, strengthens yet more the sense and force of the antithesis. "In this matter the Apostle's view is confirmed by the character of the female sex, and the experience of all times, which proves how susceptible woman is to such guile and persuasion; and his reasoning needs therefore no defence, but its truth is clear in the very nature of the subject;" Mack. [It should be remarked here, that this narrative of the fall has been held by many sound expositors as a moral truth of primitive history, not to be understood in its literal sense, but portrayed in a symbolic form. The note of Coleridge, although somewhat too much in the vein of Origen, may well be added: "We have the assurance of Bishop Horseley, that the Church of England does not demand the literal understanding of the document contained in the second (from ver. 8) and third chapters of Genesis as a point of faith; divines of the most unimpeachable orthodoxy, and the most averse to allegorizing of Scripture history in general, having from the earliest ages adopted or permitted it in this instance. . . . Nor, if we suppose any man conversant with Oriental works of anything like the same antiquity, could it surprise him to find events of true history in connection with the parable. In the temple language of Egypt, the serpent was the symbol of the understanding. . . . Without or in contravention to the reason, *the spiritual mind* of St. Paul, the understanding (φρόνημα σαρκὸς, or carnal mind) becomes the sophistic principle, the wily tempter to evil by counterfeit good; ever in league with and always first applying to the desire as the inferior nature, the woman in our humanity; and through the desire prevailing on the will (the manhood, *virtus*). . . . The Mosaic narrative, thus interpreted, gives a just and faithful exposition of the birth and parentage of sin, as it reveals itself in time;" "Aids to Reflection," p. 241, ed. 1840. Read also, for a like interpretation, Henry More, "Defence of the Moral Cabbala," c. 3.—W.]

Ver. 15. **She shall be saved in child-bearing,** &c. The Apostle seems to fear lest he may have disheartened the women, and he now adds an encouraging word. Probably it was written in the recollection of the sentence which is coupled in Gen. iii. with the story of the fall. God had changed the curse into a blessing for her as well as for Adam, and made the penalty of sin a means of grace. *She shall be saved*, σωθήσεται. A share in the salvation of Christ is not withheld from her, although she has no part in public teaching. Yet she can only gain the personal enjoyment of this grace when she remains in her allotted calling. *Through child-bearing*, διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας, proceeds the Apostle; and this expression has often been a stumbling-block. "Do you think it was Paul's opinion, at the time he wrote 1 Cor. vii., that the salvation of the female sex depends on child-bearing?" asks Schleiermacher, when he opposes the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles. The reply must be undoubtedly in the negative; but it should be added, that no reasonable man, apostle or not apostle, would take this proposition unconditionally; since, in that case, the greatest number of children would best entitle the mother to salvation. We are simply to suppose that the Apostle has in view Christian women only, for whom the question is, how they, who already believe in Christ, should personally gain the salvation they seek. It is, then, quite unnecessary to interpret the διά as meaning the outward mode of the σωθήσεται; still less to give it the sense of "notwithstanding" (Flatt); it denotes simply a condition in which the woman becomes partaker of such blessing. On this use of the preposition, see Winer, p. 339, who gives various examples. The Apostle would say: Far be the thought that the true fulfilment of the duties of a mother, as each might perhaps fear, can hinder the salvation of woman; on the contrary, she will then obtain it, when she remains in her allotted sphere of home (comp. chap. v. 14). Τεκνογονία does not mean merely the *munus puerperæ* in the strict sense of the word, but includes the Christian nurture and training of children. The notion that γυνή refers to Eve alone, or to Mary, the mother of the Lord, needs no serious refutation. The Apostle speaks of the Christian wife in general, and therefore can directly use the plural for the singular, when he adds, ἐὰν μείνωσιν. That this last clause does not refer to both men and women (Heydenreich), nor to the children (Chrysostom, Schleiermacher, Leo, Mack), is quite obvious. The last would, on account of the preceding τεκνογονία, be grammatically possible; but it is not probable, since the salvation of the woman would then be made dependent on the continuance of her children in fellowship with Christ. Calvin justly denied this view, when he wrote: "*Atqui unica vox est apud Paulum* τεκνογονία. *Proinde ad mulieres referri, necessarium est* ἐὰν μείνωσιν, κ.τ.λ. *Quod autem plurale verbum est, nomen vero singulare, nihil habet incommodi. Si quidem nomen indefinitum, ubi scilicet de omnibus communis est sermo, vim collectivi habet, ideoque mutationem numeri facile patitur. Porro ne totam*

mulierum virtutem in conjugalibus officiis includeret, continuo post etiam majores adjicit virtutes, quibus pias mulieres excellere convenit, ut a profanis differant. Imo tunc demum generatio gratum est Deo obsequium, quum ex fide et caritate procedit." This last must especially be held in view. The slightest trace of singularity vanishes, when we see what the Apostle requires of women in their Christian life. They must endure even to the end, if they will be saved (Matt. xxiv. 13). Πίστις, ἀγάπη, ἁγιασμός, are for them the chief aim, as well as for every man. By the connection of these words with σωφροσύνη, *modestia*, the exhortation again returns to its starting point, the subordinate rank of woman.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. It belongs to that universal character of Christianity which Paul has unfolded so strongly in vers. 4–7, that the worship of God must be confined to special times and places (comp. John iv. 21–24). When the Apostle assigns to the male members of the whole church the duties of preaching and instruction, he condemns, on one side, the clerical exclusiveness which allows the laity in no way to preach the word in the church, and, on the other side, the Quakerism which permits men and women, without restraint, to come forward when moved by the Spirit.

2. It shows the deep spiritual insight of the Apostle, when he urges the removal of all wrath and strife, as irreconcilable with common prayer. A similar suggestion is found in 1 Pet. iii. 7. Compare the beautiful essay of A. Vinet, entitled, *La colère et la prière*, in his *Études Evangel.*, p. 436; and most specially see the precept in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 23–25).

3. How incalculable is the debt which women owe to Christianity! how holy is the calling allotted to the believing woman by the gospel! (comp. *La Femme, deux discours, par* Ad. Monod, Paris, 1855.) While woman before was a slave, the property of the man, the mere victim of his sensual lusts, she is now joint-heir of eternal life (1 Pet. iii. 7). Although, however, the gospel sanctifies the community and the family, it does not reverse the natural order of things, but requires each to remain in the position God has given to each. This whole passage (vers. 8–15) is a continuous practical exposition of the great principle which Paul has affirmed in 1 Cor. vii. 24.

4. The high worth which the Apostle here gives to the duties of the wife and mother, shows likewise with what restrictions we must receive his partial praise of celibacy (1 Cor. vii.), and is a sound corrective of all false asceticism.

5. Christian morality must be shown in our attire; and it is never to be forgotten, that the first garments after the fall were sewed by the hand of shame. Still, it would be absurd and petty to push the outward letter of this apostolic precept, as is too often done, although this rule of St. Paul has by no means only a local or temporary meaning. Comp. De Wette, *Lehrbuch der christlichen Sittenl.*, p. 73. The question raised by the precept in ver. 9 (comp. 1 Cor. xi. 14), whether men should wear long hair, provoked in the Reformed Church of the Netherlands, in the seventeenth century, a long and hot dispute. See, for a full account, the learned work of Dr. G. D. J. Schotel, *Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis der kerkelijke en wereldlijke kleeding;* Haag, 1856.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The public prayer of the church.—The holy disposition needed for holy action.—No really devout prayer without mutual love and peace.—Humility the best dress for woman: (1.) The best home dress; (2.) the best travelling dress; (3.) the best mourning dress; (4.) the best grave-dress.—The special position which Christianity has assigned to woman: (1.) What Christ is for women; (2.) What women must be for Christ.—The eloquence of a Christian silence.—Ministering love, true greatness in the kingdom of God.—The subordination of woman to man grounded not in man's arbitrary will, but in the order of God at creation. Woman should not forget that sin has come into the world, not first through man, but through her.—The last created was the first deceived.—The Xanthippe character not only unchristian, but unnatural.—The curse of sin on the woman changed, through the grace of God, into a blessing.—The nobleness and blessedness of the calling of a mother.—We may be lost even in the bearing of children, if we remain not in faith and holiness, as well as chastity.—The saving power of the gospel in our home life.—Christianity promotes reformation, not revolution.—"Let all things be done decently and in order" (1 Cor. xiv. 40).

Starke: Hedinger: Prayer without glow, without an enkindled spirit, is not good.—Unbelief destroys the best.—Lange's *Op. Bibl.:* Although prayer specially concerns the heart, yet the right direction of the heart will lead to the fit manner of prayer.—Spener: The Apostle specially wishes that, in the public worship of God, our thoughts should be more on the inward than the outward.—Women, when they pray or attend Divine service, must not think that they are to prepare for it by splendid dress, gold, pearls, outward ornament, or that such array will please God.—Hedinger: Lavish ornament is the fruit of pride.—Both errors are to be shunned: pomp, and slavish copying of every empty fashion, as well as neglect, uncleanliness, and disorder in dress; for neither becomes a Christian.—Lange's *Op.:* In dress we must be guided partly by necessity, partly by comfort, partly, too, by the custom of the country; and thus we must reject all servility and all vain show (1 John ii. 15, 16).—If woman should learn, then man should allow her the opportunity, to be a good teacher at home, not only in words, but in deeds also (1 Cor. iv. 35).—Much of the discord among married persons usually springs from the fact that the wife will not be subordinate, or the husband does not know how to rule with intelligence and love, and thus misuses his rule (1 Pet. iii. 7).—Osiander: Since woman is given to man as a help-meet, not a ruler, the right of authority and precedence belongs to man.—Even before the fall, Eve was weaker than Adam; so that Satan turned not to Adam, but to Eve, and led her first astray from God (1 Pet. iii. 7).—The Apostle does not deny salvation to childless women, but only teaches what is the appointed calling of women, in which holy mothers, by the grace of the Mediator Christ, through faith, attain eternal life.—Lange's *Op.:* As faith is not without love, so faith and love are not without salvation.—Hedinger: Believing women who have children have this comfort, that their hardest pain,

and even the loss of life, is only a trial sent from the heavenly Father, never a hindrance to salvation (Rom. viii. 35).

VON GERLACH: It follows from the right spirit of prayer, that our works should be in harmony with our words, and especially in public devotion.—Man, at creation, was complete; but the woman had given her, in her origin, the lot of dependence.—Many who have children are lost; many who are childless are saved.

HEUBNER: The prayerful Christian consecrates every place as a temple.—The holiest places cannot help him who prays with an unholy spirit.—Dress, the most foolish of vanities.—The Christian woman even in dress shows herself Christian.—True order in the Christian Church edifies the whole.—The woman is blessed as a mother, when she cares for the good Christian nurture of her children.—The specific duties of man and woman.—LISCO: Husband and wife in prayer before God.—The right place of women in the sanctuary.—The true ornament of the Christian in worship.

VII.

The proper temper of the overseers of the community, of the deacons, and of their wives.

A.—Dignity and nature of the office of the overseer.

CH. III. 1–7.

1 This *is* a true[1] saying [Faithful is the saying], If a man desire [aspire unto]
2 the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work. A bishop then must be blame-
less, the husband of one wife, vigilant,[2] sober, of good behaviour [decorous
3 = *ornatum*], given to hospitality, apt to teach; [,] Not given to wine, no striker,
not greedy of filthy lucre;[3] [,] but patient, not a brawler, not covetous; [,]
4 One that ruleth well his own house,[4] having his children in subjection with
5 all gravity; [—] For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how
6 shall he take care of the church of God? [—] Not a novice, lest being
lifted up [blinded] with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil.
7 Moreover he must have[5] a good report of them which are without; lest he fall
into reproach and the snare of the devil.

[1] Ver. 1.—[πιστὸς; all the authorities; the Sinaiticus. But Δ., Orig. also, ἀνθρώπινος; *humanus, hæc lectio vetustior est Hieronymo.* But no one is rash enough to approve it. Matthäi, quoted by Huther.—E. H.]

[2] Ver. 2.—[νηφάλεον. Every one now reads νηφάλιον.—E. H.]

[3] Ver. 3.—μὴ αἰσχροκερδῆ. Wanting in A. D. F. G., and others, and upon this account Lachmann and Tischendorf have left it out. The Sinaiticus has it not. Apparently it has been intercalated from Titus i. 7.

[4] Ver. 4.—[προϊστάμενον. So *Recepta*, Lachmann, Tischendorf. The Sinaiticus reads προϊσταυόμενον—peculiar and exceptional.—E. H.]

[5] Ver. 7.—[δεῖ δὲ αὐτόν; αὐτόν left out by Lachmann and Tischendorf (wanting in A. F. G. H., and others); not in the Sinaiticus. In G., the whole seventh verse is written in the margin; according to Lachmann.—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **This is a true saying.** There is no reason whatever to refer this phrase, which often occurs in the Pastoral Epistles, to the preceding remarks (Chrysostom); it is clear, on the contrary, that here, as chap. i. 15, there begins a new line of thought. After the Apostle, in the former chapter, has treated of the duties of the church as a whole, especially in regard of public prayer, he turns to the special view of certain persons, the *episcopi* and *diaconi*. Undoubtedly it would fall to the lot of Timothy, in his intimate relations to the body, to appoint such officers; and as there might arise a difference of opinion, it was desirable for him to have a written direction from the Apostle, to which he might always appeal. Paul begins, therefore, by informing him, as Titus (chap. i. 6), what special qualities such officers should possess. It is from his own knowledge, doubtless, of the high importance of this function of the *episcopus*, that he considers first its weighty requirements.—**If a man desire,** &c. It appears as if, at that time, there was in Ephesus, and its neighborhood, an eager strife for such a presbyterial rank—a strife which contrasts strikingly with the reluctance shown to its acceptance by so many eminent men in the third and fourth centuries; and as it certainly did not spring with all from the purest motives, it does not give us the happiest proof of their Christian spirit. Yet we need not understand ὀρέγεται in the sense of an ambitious rivalry (thus De Wette, against which comp. Heb. xi. 16), since the Apostle would surely have rebuked it with decision. It may have been joined, on the part of many, with an active zeal for the church, which needed only a partial check and guidance.—**The office of a bishop,** ἐπισκοπή. The word does not before occur in this sense in the New Testament, with the exception of the citation from the Old Testament (Acts i. 20). As to its real meaning, it is proven beyond doubt that in the days of the Apostle the ἐπίσκοποι had no higher rank than the πρεσβύτεροι, although Paul (1 Tim. v. 17) makes a distinction even among the latter · and it is

certain, likewise, that first in later times, by the combined influence of various causes, a higher place was given to the bishops among their fellow episcopi (Acts xx. 17, 28). The rule of the church at large was entrusted to the Apostles; that of the individual communities, to the episcopate or presbyterate. On the diaconate, which is not at all identical with these last, see below, ver. 8.—**He desireth a good work,** καλον ἔργον ἐπιϑ. The adjective expresses the excellence, the noun the difficulty of the work; since ἔργον, in this connection, is not the same as πρᾶγμα or χρῆμα. The Apostle regards it not as a passive, but an active reality; and AUGUSTIN thus far wrote with truth, *De Civ. Dei*, xix. 19: "*Episcopatus est nomen operis, non honoris.*"—JEROME: "*Opus, non dignitatem, non delicias; opus per quod humilitate decrescat, non intumescat fastigio.*" BENGEL: "*Negotium, non otium.*" On the whole subject here treated by Paul, we may well compare the *Tractatus* by JOH. DE WICLEF, *De Officio Pastorali*, published by Dr. G. B. Lechler, Leipzig, 1863. He treats of two points, *de sanctimonio vitæ, et de salubritate doctrinæ*, and gives suggestions to be laid to heart.

[*Note, on the Presbyter-Episcopal Office.*—This verse is the *crux* of the whole controversy concerning the ministry of the apostolic church, and should not, therefore, be passed by with so slight notice as in this commentary. We will endeavor here to give an impartial, critical summary of the evidence contained in the Pastoral Epistles. It is clear, from 1 Tim. iii. 1–7; Titus i. 5–9, that the titles "episcopus" and "presbyter" belonged at first to the same rank. See BINGHAM, "Ch. Antiq.," B. 1, c. 3; SCHAFF, "Apost. Ch.," B. 3, c. 3, and the citation from JEROME, Ep. 82, *Ad Oceanum*. Presbyter was the earlier Jewish-Christian name, *nomen ætatis*; episcopus the later, taken from political usage among the Greeks, *nomen officii*. The former very probably denoted the general ministerial dignity; the latter, the oversight of a particular church. The restriction of the episcopate to a superior order, therefore, came later. Was it of apostolic date or authority? We turn to this Epistle, and it is clear that Timothy had the power of judging presbyters; 1 Tim. iv. 11, 14; ch. v. 1, 17–24; and the power of ordaining them; 1 Tim. v. 22. The power of ordaining elders in every city is also given to Titus, i. 2; the injunction to rebuke with all authority, Titus ii. 15. We omit 2 Tim. i. 6, 14; chap. ii. 2, since these are too vague for any fair argument. Timothy and Titus, then, were commissioned by St. Paul, and had the two powers of ordination and of judicial rule. See HOOKER, *Eccl. Pol.*, B. 7, c. 11, where the argument is forcibly stated. But the next question is, was this superior office a temporary or permanent one? Were these diocesan bishops, or only evangelists, sent on a special mission? It cannot be proved with certainty, from these Epistles, that they were more than evangelists. Timothy, moreover, is charged to "do the work of an evangelist," 2 Tim. iv. 5. Titus is spoken of, 2 Cor. viii. 23, with other brethren, as "messengers of the churches." See CALVIN, *Inst.* iv. 3, s. 4. The fact of their superior authority appears to us, then, a presumptive argument for the establishment of the episcopate; yet it cannot be a demonstration. But a further question remains: How can this change of name be explained, by which the later bishop became higher than the presbyter? It is the received theory of the Episcopal divine, that when the apostolic authority had thus passed into this diocesan form, the official title was restricted to the higher rank. The name, it is said, is unimportant, but the fact is the essential. See BINGHAM, B. 2, c. 19. But this does not wholly meet the difficulty. It is not at all likely, had these new diocesan rulers been appointed directly, like Timothy and Titus, by the Apostles, that they would have taken a name appropriated to a lower order. The change points naturally to some election of a presbyter by the college as their chief. This sufficiently explains the case, and appears the most probable custom in the early church. Thus FIELD, "Of the Church," B. 5, c. 27. Yet it is, after all, uncertain whether this was done in all cases, as he claims, by the direct choice of the Apostles, or by the choice of the body. There can be little doubt, however, from the appointment of Timothy and Titus, that such a superior order of men was becoming the general rule of the church, and that, too, with the permission, if not by the ordinance of the Apostles. We must, then, draw our conclusion from these meagre and uncertain hints. The chief error has been on either hand, that men have judged the plastic, growing institutions of the early church by the fixed order of a later age. It is enough to say, that toward the close of the lives of St. Paul and St. John, there was a natural, historic change of the church, as it became settled in its great social centres, from the general rule of the apostolate to a diocesan structure. See ROTHE, *Anfänge d. christl. Kirche*, p. 498, ff. We see, in the cases of Timothy and Titus, the germinal form of such an episcopal office. It was a legitimate outgrowth. It had the sanction of the Apostles. To say that it was the invention of a later age, an apostasy from primitive parity or democracy, is unhistoric. Such a structural change could not have taken place without conflict; and the very silence of the sub-apostolic records, the undisputed right with which diocesan episcopacy emerges at the opening of authentic church history, confirms it as primitive. Yet it is alike unhistoric to rear this fact into a *jus divinum*, or to identify this simple episcopate of the early church with the type of a later hierarchy. Compare also the numerous works on the Ignatian controversy, by Cureton, Bunsen, Baur, Lipsius, Uhlhorn, and others.—W.]

Ver. 2. **A bishop then must be,** &c. Here follows a long list of qualifications, partly negative, and wholly concerned with the circle of daily, household life; since the Apostle is not speaking here of the higher gifts of Spirit and faith, which should be lacking in no Christian, least of all in an *episcopus*. All which is needed for the life hid with Christ, is passed by in silence, that he may consider solely the special requisites of the office. This fully met his purpose, as he speaks only of the aspirants to the episcopate, not of those already in it; and this apostolic rule was to serve Timothy as a safeguard against the importunity of incapable and unworthy men.—**Then,** οὖν, joins the following counsel with the previous praise of the office. Bengel: "*Bonum negotium, bonis committendum.*"—**Blameless, the husband of one wife.** Two qualifications are named first, which the Apostle holds of highest worth. The episcopus must be blameless, ἀνεπίληπτον εἶναι, in good repute, without offence in the eyes of believers, as well as of the unbelieving world. Thus he would be by no means blameless, were he

not μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνήρ. Is this phrase to be understood as forbidding polygamy or deuterogamy to the newly-appointed overseer? Scholars are not agreed, and the subject itself is far from clear. It is cited in favor of the former view, that polygamy was by no means strange among the Jews; see JUSTIN M., *Dial c. Tryph.*, § 134, ed. Colon; that this custom was less common among the Greeks, and might give offence; that Christianity expressly enjoins and demands monogamy. The champions of the other view maintain that Timothy hardly needed the warning not to choose an episcopus who had several wives, since the unfitness of so sensual a man for this spiritual office would be self-evident; that, on the other hand, a second marriage might not have been approved by the Greeks; that Paul did not prescribe this abstinence as a general rule (the opposite is clear from 1 Cor. vii. 8, 39), but that this may rightly have been enjoined on such officers, who were to set an example of the highest self-restraint; and that, finally, in chap. v. 9, it is required of a widow, chosen as deaconess, to have been once only married. The last reason seems of the greatest weight; and we therefore agree with those who hold this command of Paul to be directed against a second marriage, as unseemly for the episcopal office. As to the question how far this rule should be considered binding now, we cannot better reply than with Heubner, *in loco:* "Perhaps the rude, quarrelsome disposition of the stepmother, in the servile condition of women at that time, was the cause of this law. With us such a reason is no longer applicable; and, on the contrary, the nurture of the young often requires a second marriage. If we regard marriage ideally, as the heartfelt union of two persons, wholly surrendered to each other, then a second marriage seems to disparage the first, or to be rather a thing of policy than love. Our general inference is, that a church teacher should conform to the usages of the country or the society in which he lives, so far as he can." That, however, Christian antiquity had really no favorable opinion of second marriage, is seen from ATHENAG., *Legat. pro Christo*, p. 37. THEOPHILUS *ad Autolyc.* iii. p. 127, ed. Colon. MINUCIUS FELIX OCTAV.: "*Unius matrimonii vinculo libenter adhæremus, cupiditate procreandi aut unam scimus, aut nullam.*" TERTULLIAN. *ad ux.* i. 7. *Exhort. Castit.*, c. 7. *De Monogamia*, c. 12. ORIGENES, *Contr. Celsum*, iii. p. 141, and elsewhere. (According to DIOD. SIC. xiii. 12, the old Sicilian legislator Charondas had deemed that he who gave his children a stepmother, should not hold office as judge.) The wisdom of this apostolic rule was specially suited to that time, when Christians were anxious to avoid whatever might harm their reputation with the heathen. The view, that Paul speaks here only of the married state, as a *conditio sine quâ non* for the episcopi, or that he merely discourages anything unusual, immoral, or illegal in the married life of such officers, does not fully explain his language. We may mention, as a curious view, still another of some Romish expositors, that by the γυνή here named should be understood the church. Such finespun ingenuity cannot destroy the strong argument which this passage contains against the law of Gregory VII. enforcing celibacy. [Conybeare has here a suggestive note. "In the corrupt facility of divorce allowed both by Greek and Roman law, it was very common for man and wife to separate, and marry other parties during the life of each other. Thus, a man might have three or four living wives, or women who had successively been his wives. An example of this may be found in the English colony of Mauritius, where the French revolutionary law of divorce had been left unrepealed by the English Government; and it is not uncommon to meet in society three or four women who have all been wives of one man, and three or four men who have all been husbands of one woman. This *successive* rather than *simultaneous* polygamy is perhaps forbidden here." —W.]—**Vigilant, sober, of good behaviour,** &c. *Vigilant*, νηφάλιος; here probably in the sense of spiritual vigilance, since it would else make a tautology with ver. 3; having thus the same meaning as prudent, judicious, and joined, therefore, with σώφρων, the opposite of that violent disposition which can never keep the right measure. *Of good behaviour;* orderly, so that his whole conduct has in it nothing unseemly; the outward sign of the inward state, expressed by σώφρων.—**Given to hospitality** (comp. Titus i. 8); especially toward so many Christian brethren (Rom. xii. 13; Heb. xiii. 2; 1 Pet. iv. 9).—**Apt to teach.** It appears, from chap. v. 17, that he counts worthy of special honor the episcopi, who labor in word and doctrine (comp. 2 Tim. ii. 24).

Ver. 3. **Not given to wine** = μὴ οἴνῳ πολλῷ προσέχοντας, ver. 8 (comp. Titus i. 7); a vice usually leading to quarrel, and hence the phrase just after: **No striker;** one who, in his rage, would soon use blows against his opponents. [Wordsworth notices that this injunction against striking shows the impulsive vehemence of the Oriental character. We may add, that it shows the half-Christianized morality of the early Church, which could need such precepts in regard to the first rules of social conduct. The history of church councils in the East supplies too many shameful illustrations.—W.]—**But patient,** ἐπιεικῆ; the opposite of a quarrelsome character. Luther: Gentle.—**Not a brawler,** ἄμαχον; shunning all needless strifes. Luther: Not wrangling.—**Not covetous,** ἀφιλάργυρον; free from that selfish greed which so often begets wrath and strife (comp. 1 Tim. vi. 10; Heb. xiii. 5). We know how often the Lord warned His disciples to beware of covetousness (Luke xvi. 14, and elsewhere).

Ver. 4. **One that ruleth well his own house.** Bengel: "*Multi, foris mansueti, domi eo minus coercent iracundiam, erga conjuges,*" &c. The Apostle requires of the episcopus that he shall make his own family a little Christian community. *House* here embraces the members of the whole household, the private family, in distinction from the public affairs of the Christian body (ver. 5). Slaves are therefore included; but the Apostle has in special view the good training of the children.—**Having his children in subjection.** Here, as often, ἔχοντα = κατέχοντα; see Wolf on this passage. Subjection is regarded as the wholesome rein to check all lawless, froward actions in the children.—**With all gravity,** does not apparently refer to the children (Wiesinger, Huther), since the word fitly signifies the gravity of the manly and the epicopal character; it betokens, too, the way in which the father must do his duty (comp. Titus ii. 15), by the needful exercise of his paternal power. The justice of such a requirement is obvious, as the firmness which enables us to rule our own household must be needed to guide the community; and he who lacks this in the smaller, personal sphere, cannot exhibit it in the greater. In the following verse this is still more plainly urged.

Ver. 5. **For if a man know not,** &c. A parenthetical proposition, containing a conclusion *a minori ad majus*.—**Take care,** ἐπιμελεῖσθαι; to nourish, provide for, administer—almost identical with the foregoing προΐστασθαι. It is used in Luke x. 34, of the care of the Samaritan for the wounded Jew. Theodoret: "ὁ τὰ σμικρὰ οἰκονομεῖν οὐκ εἰδὼς πῶς δύναται τῶν κρειττόνων καὶ θείων πιστευθῆναι τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν."

Ver. 6. **Not a novice,** νεόφυτος, newly planted; *i. e.*, who has shortly since become a convert to Christianity. Undoubtedly, in a community so recently established, there must have been such a novice now and then placed in the episcopal office. But in Ephesus, where the church had existed some years already, Timothy could more easily choose among those who, earlier or later, had professed the gospel; and it was wise, therefore, not to include the latter among those raised to the episcopal office. This meets the objections of De Wette. It was not merely youth, but the lack of necessary knowledge and experience, which marked the novice; and he would, besides, be in danger of being misled by his pride.—**Lifted up,** τυφωθείς; literally, beclouded, darkened, befooled; *i. e.*, from pride and self-delusion, through his promotion to such rank above even older converts. There could be no readier sin for the newly converted than such self-exaltation, and, above all, if they were placed in any eminent position; the grace of God must keep them in the path of humility, discipline, and suffering. The following words, **lest he fall into the condemnation of the devil,** are variously explained. Luther has: "That he be not puffed up, and fall under the judgment of the slanderers;" *i. e.*, give occasion to slanderers. Others (Mosheim, Wegscheider) refer it to calumnious men. But there is no reason, when τοῦ διαβ. is here used, to understand by it aught save the father of lies, the murderer from the beginning. Nor is the idea satisfactory (Matthies), that the principle of evil is here denoted; but we think it should have the significance of the inward spiritual Power of evil. But what is the condemnation (κρίμα) of the devil? Not the judgment which the devil brings on those who fall under his influence (*Genit. subjecti*); for here Bengel's remark applies: "*Diabolus potest opprobrium inferre, judicium inferre non potest; non enim judicat, sed judicatur.*" But it is rather the judgment which has been fulfilled in the case of the devil (*Genit. objecti*), and will reach, likewise, all who are led astray by pride. Jerome: "*Tale judicium, in quod etiam diabolus incidit.*" Κρίμα is not merely denunciation, accusation (Matthies), but, as often, in the sense of κατάκριμα or τιμωρία = the sentence of condemnation. If we compare this passage with 2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude 6, we may infer that pride was the chief cause of the devil's fall. Bengel: "*Videtur prius quam alii angeli ad præfecturam super multos angelos, licet multis junior esset, fuisse suscitatus et erectus, quod ipsum ei quoque occasio superbiæ fuit.*" Comp. Artemonius, *ad init. Joh. præfect.*, p. 23.

Ver. 7. **Moreover, he must,** &c. A last requisite is added to the rest. It is not enough that the episcopus should be blameless in the eyes of the community (ver. 2), but he must have a truly good report from those without; that is, who are not, or no longer members of the Christian body.—**Lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil.** If before his nomination he had lived in gross sin, yet had been appointed, the remembrance of his old vices would still remain with those who had known him, and this might bring suspicion on the office itself. It was better for such a man, even after a genuine conversion, to retire into the seclusion of a private life, than take a prominent place. Otherwise he would fall εἰς ὀνειδισμόν—into suspicion,—whether deserved or not, and from those, too, within as well as without the community; and thus, in his weakness and depression, he might readily fall into the snare of the devil, παγίδα τ. διαβ. Deprived of his good name, he might lapse into the same sins which he had scarcely renounced, and become as evil as he was reputed to be. "*Quid enim spei restat, si nullius peccati pudor?*" Calvin. As ὀνειδισμόν and παγίδα are not separated by εἰς, we must consider the former no less than the latter as the work of the devil.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The worth of the episcopal office, which Paul has here so impressively set forth, has been affirmed in all ages and in manifold ways. Compare, *e. g.*, Chrysostom, *De Sacerdotio;* Baxter, "Reformed Pastor;" Burk, "Pastoral Theology in its Examples;" and the well-known writings of Harms, Vinet, Nitzsch, Ebrard, Moll, Löhe, and others. "*Pastor habet triplex officium; primo, verbo Dei spiritualiter pascere oves suas; secundo, purgare prudenter oves suas a scabie, ne sese et alios magis inficiant; tertio, defendere oves suas a lupis rapacibus, tam sensibilibus quam insensibilibus;*" Wiclef.

2. Undoubtedly the Greek church, in forbidding second marriage to its clergy, has a support in the μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνήρ of Paul. Yet it is quite another question how far the Apostle enjoins the literal fulfilment, in all countries, times, and circumstances, of the precept which he gave for Ephesus. The opponents of the papal hierarchy—which has found so strong a prop in the law of celibacy—rightly point to the liberty given by Paul to the episcopi, of entering once at least into marriage. A compulsory abstinence, without any special calling to it, is surely most unlike the spirit of the Apostle. Yet, whether the eagerness, with which many young pastors of the evangelical church unite their entrance into the ministry with their marriage, would always have his sanction, is quite a doubtful question. All depends on the time and circumstances; but it might be wished that, in the choice of their wives, clergymen would not quite forget the Christian church to which they may be so useful. Compare the "Mirror of a Good Clergyman's Wife," by Chr. Burk, 1842. [See Wordsworth for a valuable note on the usage of the Eastern and Western churches in regard of the Apostle's rule. It seems to have been a general, unwritten law, yet not held of perpetual obligation, or enforced by any decree of general councils. In the time of Callistus, at the beginning of the second century, we learn from Hippolytus that persons twice or thrice married were admitted to the ministry. The whole passage, however, is most striking as a picture of the simple, healthful household life of the primitive clergyman, in contrast with the later diseased type of the Latin church.—W.]

3. It is a noteworthy proof of the practical spirit of Christianity, that the Apostle gives such special worth to the domestic and social virtues even in the official rulers of the community. A life of faith and

morality are indivisible in his view. The pastor of the church must above all be a good father in his own family, and that even to the least particulars. If there be those who think that the care of their wider sphere of labor will not permit them to attend to such private duties, the Apostle sets before them our Lord's words: "These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone" (Matt. xxiii. 23). The family of the clergyman must specially deserve the name of a little household church. "He must have a hundred eyes on every side; his spiritual vision must be sharp, not short-sighted. He must be awake, not for self, but for others;" Chrysostom. It is notable that the same Church father laments, in eloquent words, that his care for his large flock hardly left him time to think and watch over his own soul. 44 Hom. *in Act. App. Opp.* ix. p. 335, ed. Montfauc.

4. With reason Paul here enjoins that an episcopus should be ἀφιλάργυρος. If this vice be the root of all evil in general, the life of Judas Iscariot and Simon Magus show what injury it has done to the clergy and the church; and we may say in this view, that the history of simony is no less shameful than that of celibacy.

5. The words of Paul on the condemnation of the devil is a striking contribution to the New Testament dæmonology, although he gives us but a glance behind the raised veil. The representation of Satan as a fallen angel makes a marked distinction between this scriptural doctrine and the Persian dualism from which it is so often sought to be derived.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The high worth of the episcopal office.—"If any man desireth the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work." This is clear from (1.) Its origin; (2.) its nature; (3.) its lineage; (4.) its object; (5.) its fruit.—The episcopal office: (1.) A work; (2.) a noble work; (3.) a work which every one should not desire.—The due qualifications named by Paul are: (1.) Manifold; (2.) difficult; (3.) just; (4.) rich in blessing.—The evangelical clergyman is called to be a pattern of all personal, domestic, and social virtues.—The clergyman (1.) a householder of God in the church; (2.) in his own dwelling.—Use and abuse of the saying, "Whoso careth not for his own house," &c.—The rocks which are in the way of a newly-converted man.—Through high to low, through low to high.—The value of a blameless youth to him who would feed the flock of God.—The snare of the devil in the office of pastor and teacher.

STARKE: Art thou of high rank, and therefore ashamed to be a preacher of Christ? yet believe it, the office is noble and weighty; it has to do with the greatest things; it regards the salvation of souls, and eternal life.—A preacher may be unmarried without wrong, yet it is better for many reasons that he marry.—Continence of body must be joined with soberness of soul, in him who would grow in spiritual prudence, discretion, foresight.—LANGE'S *Opus:* Covetousness is a hidden, shameful lust, especially in a clergyman.—STARKE: A clergyman may be zealous, but not deal blows like a godless man.—A teacher who would not make his family an offence to the church, must look to it that he choose a devout help-meet; else, if he make a blind and carnal choice, he will lay the corner-stone of great evil.—A man can more easily rule his household, than a whole community: (1.) Because it is far smaller; (2.) because the household will sooner obey than strangers; (3.) because he associates more with them than with others; (4.) because he naturally treats them with more affection than others.—If a new convert be unfit for the office of teacher, how much more an unconverted person.—The shame and vice of a teacher are snares of the devil, whereby Satan robs his office of its blessing (1 Cor. ix. 12).

LISCO: The personal characteristics of a servant of the word.

HEUBNER: The bishop must consider his good appearing, his good fame, not hold it lightly because of his real purity; for his good fame adds to his influence.—Covetousness is a blot on the character of a clergyman.—Loss of honor often makes a man dull and base; honor leads to self-respect.—Perhaps the Apostle regarded the higher virtues, here omitted, as acknowledged requisites, and would only keep us from undervaluing those lower ones; or he would guide us upward from the outward conduct of life, here sketched, to the inward gifts.

B.—Character of the Deacons and Deaconesses.

CH. III. 8–13.

8 Likewise *must* the deacons *be* grave, not double-tongued, not given to much
9 wine, not greedy of filthy lucre; [,] Holding the mystery of the faith in a
10 pure conscience.[1] And let these also first be proved; [,] then let them use the
11 office of a deacon, being *found* blameless. Even so *must their* wives *be* grave,
12 not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things. Let the deacons be the husbands
13 of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well. For they that
have used the office of a deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree
[secure to themselves good standing], and great boldness in the faith which is
in Christ Jesus.

[1] Ver. 9.—[The Sinaiticus is peculiar here. All the critical authorities read ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει, instead of which it has καθαρᾶς συνειδήσεως. Were this the true reading, the sense would be, "holding the mystery of the faith and of a pure conscience.—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 8. **Likewise the deacons.** After the Acts of the Apostles have told us the origin of the diaconate (chap. vi. 1–5), we may learn from the Pastoral Letters the qualifications needed, in Paul's judgment, for a good deacon. This passage is important, as it is the only one which portrays the character so clearly as to be a true mirror for all after times. Here, as with the episcopi (vers. 1–7), the Apostle omits the higher requisites of spirit and disposition, to consider rather the domestic and moral qualities which men readlily see and judge in others. It is true that the characteristics here named agree in many points with those of the presbyter (vers. 1-7); but this likeness lies in the nature of the case and the relationship of both offices, and thus, instead of being at all extraordinary, furnishes an added proof of the genuineness of these Epistles. For, were a marked difference made between the episcopus and diaconus in rank and character, this Epistle would bear the unquestionable stamp of a later age, since, in the day of Paul, both *munera* were nearly alike. Besides, both divisions differ sufficiently in slight details, which show again the wisdom of the Apostle. See, on the diaconate in general, LECHLER on Acts vi. 1–5.—**Grave, not double-tongued.** There is no proof that, in the apostolic time, there existed a special, exclusive class, a *collegium* of church assistants, who had charge of the various duties of the diaconate. All depended on individual activity; and it was therefore the more necessary that such persons should be of superior worth, and honorably fulfil the office. It is not, however, difficult to see the design of the Apostle in urging these requirements, although naturally we may not expect a complete sketch or an exact order in the recital of them.—*Grave* (with ὡσαύτως we must supply δεῖ εἶναι from the preceding), σεμνοὺς (comp. 1 Tim. ii. 2; Titus ii. 2); not so much a special virtue for a deacon, as a Christian quality which every church officer must possess. We may take Stephen and Philip as patterns of the true σεμνότης of a Christian deacon.—*Not double-tongued*, μὴ διλόγους; a word used only here. Bengel: "*Ad alios alia loquentes.*" In the manifold relations of the deacons with different persons and families, they might readily fall into this vice, so wholly unworthy of a man of character.—**Not given to much wine** (comp. Titus ii. 3). He who would not merely aid poverty, but as far as possible heal it, must be himself a pattern of temperance.—**Not greedy of filthy lucre,** μὴ αἰσχροκερδεῖς (comp. ver. 3). Any who was capable of this, would soon appropriate dishonestly the gifts entrusted to him for the poor.

Ver. 9. **The mystery . . . pure conscience.** Here is the same inward connection of faith and conscience as before, chap. i. 18; and it is an equally strong proof that the Apostle is by no means content with the mere outward blamelessness of the church officers, if this higher spiritual faith be lacking.—Τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως; a peculiar expression, not occurring elsewhere. The mystery here, as 1 Cor. ii. 7, the truth, before hidden, but now revealed (comp. Rom. xvi. 25).—**Of the faith**; a *Genitiv. subjecti*, just as, in ver. 16, τὸ μυστήριον τῆς εὐσεβείας; a mystery which is the object of faith, and can be understood only by faith. The Apostle presupposes that this mystery is like a treasure in the actual possession of the deacons; and to the question, how it can best be preserved, he answers with this precept: "Ἔχοντας τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει." The pure conscience is the coffer in which the treasure is best deposited. Ἔχοντας used here, as often, almost in the sense of κατέχοντας. Although we must grant that this clause does not directly refer to the diaconate, but is entirely general (De Wette), yet it is obvious that such a life of faith and conscience must be most useful toward even official duty. As teaching and preaching were not the usual charge of the deacons, they must so much the more upbuild others by their action; and without this personal faith and conscientiousness they could not fulfil their difficult task. "*Additur pura conscientia, quæ extenditur ad totam vitam, tum vero, ut sciant se Deo servire;*" Calvin.

Ver. 10. **And let these also first be proved.** These no less than the presbyters. The Apostle had not, indeed (chap. ii. 1–7), expressly ordered a previous δοκιμάζειν for these persons, but it lies in the nature of the case, especially in the restriction, ver. 5. We are not told by whom this proof was to be made, or to what special points it should extend. It could not have been a public one, before the whole community, since it was already presumed that those called to the diaconate enjoyed a good name and character. It is better to suppose an inquiry by Timothy himself, and the associate episcopi, since the deacons had probably their formal appointment from these last. That it was an examination in the proper sense (Heubner), is as improbable as the notion (Heydenreich) that we are to suppose the "united voices, and questions all around," from individuals of the congregation. This is surely too official and modern a conception. Far simpler Bengel: "*Diaconi debebant prius edere specimen sui in ipsâ diaconiâ, quam plene immitterentur in munus.*" They could enter on their office, after their blamelessness had been proved. This proof was thus, in the main, of a prohibitory character, to keep the unworthy from office.

Ver. 11. **Even so must their wives . . . in all things.** This direction concerning the wives has a somewhat singular place amidst the rules of the diaconate. Were not the passage beyond all critical doubt, we might regard it as an interpolation. The connection does not allow us to think of Christian women in general; nor does the Apostle speak of deaconesses alone, as such, since in chap. v. this class is distinctly treated of. We are almost unwillingly forced to apply this to the wives of deacons (Matthies); although it is remarkable, again, that the Apostle should give such express precepts for these, yet none for the wives of the presbyters, who had yet higher rank. The reason of this may be found, however, in the fact that the wives of the deacons were entrusted also with the office of deaconess; which compels us to the opinion that, by the word γυναῖκας, must be understood the wives of deacons, in so far as they were deaconesses also, and thus subject to certain rules here suggested beforehand, but more expressly given in chap. v. These requisites are such as every Christian woman should have, yet they are specially desirable and indispensable to the sisters who would undertake a public office in the church.—**Not slanderers,** μὴ διαβόλους; literally, not devils—which they undoubtedly would be should they be guilty of lying and slander. "Why is it that evil-speaking is so characteristic of

women? A woman has no arms, weapons, brute force, like man; her tongue is her weapon; and her natural feeling of dependence makes her more susceptible to envy and rivalry;" Heubner.—This qualification of the deacons' wives has its relative contrast with the requirement made of the husbands; μὴ διλόγους, just as the νηφαλίους points back to the preceding, μὴ οἴνῳ πολλῷ προσέχοντας. **—Faithful in all things,** is a precept indeed for all, but specially for women, who in their allotted sphere must practise this fidelity in little things, and therefore not overlook or despise it.

Ver. 12. **Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife.** See ver. 2.—**Ruling their children and their own houses well.** See vers. 4, 5. The domestic virtue of deacons must not be inferior to that of presbyters. Care of their own children was doubtless the best preparatory school for care of the poor and sick.

Ver. 13. **For they that have used, &c.** To call forth an earnest attention to his precepts, the Apostle points to the noble reward of the faithful man. Undoubtedly, in his view, they only would deserve it who made such rules their own, and thus fulfilled them.—Such **purchase to themselves a good degree,** βαθμὸν καλόν. Βαθμός, *gradus*, the Ionic form of the Attic βασμός (from βαίνω), may be understood either in reference to church office, or to the spiritual state. If, in the former view, we see in this phrase a promotion to the presbyterial office (Jerome, Bengel, and others), we must presuppose a kind of hierarchical order, which is quite foreign to the apostolic time. This interpretation is not at all necessary by grammatical rule; indeed, the description of this higher official degree as καλόν sounds somewhat singularly; nor can we conceive of any connection between such advancement and the παῤῥησία spoken of just after. We therefore prefer their view who interpret it as a good step in spiritual life, or future blessedness—two meanings which may well be united, and between which to put *either—or* (De Wette, Huther, and others), we think unnecessary. The Christian life here and hereafter is, in the Apostle's view, one united whole; and in proportion as we advance here in our spiritual growth, shall we reach undoubtedly a higher degree of blessedness. It has been often said, indeed, but never proved, that Paul knows no degrees in future happiness. The opposite rather appears from 1 Cor. iii. 15; xv. 41, 42; 2 Cor. ix. 6, and elsewhere. A faithful fulfilment of our calling in the Church of Christ is the means blessed of Him to win here, as in eternity, a good degree of growth and of salvation. [It seems most agreeable to our conceptions of justice, and is consonant enough to the language of Scripture, to suppose that there are prepared for us rewards and punishments of all possible degrees, from the most exalted happiness down to the extremest misery, so that our labor is never in vain; whatever our advancement in virtue, we procure a proportionable accession of future happiness; PALEY, "Mor. Phil.," B. 1, c. 7.—W.]—**And great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus.** This second part of the promise expresses the reward which such fidelity will gain from others; as βασμός referred to that which the diaconus would gain for himself. Παῤῥησία, used in this absolute sense, does not mean boldness of faith before God, but boldness of conscience before men, and, indeed, before the church, in whose employment such deacons as breathed this spirit could not have reproach. Bengel joins them both: "*Fiducia erga Deum et homines.*" *Faith in Christ Jesus* does not belong exclusively to παῤῥησία, but as well to βαθμός; meaning the ground in which this confidence is rooted, and on which this degree is built. It is obvious that πίστις must not be taken objectively of Christian doctrine, but subjectively of the personal life of faith. [βαθμός is rendered, by Conybeare, *position*. Alford inclines to this reading, but refers it also, with De Wette and Wiesinger, to the hope of the future, as well as the present life. We cannot, however, see force enough in the above reasoning to reject the generally received idea of an official promotion. Undoubtedly the hierarchical ideas of the day of Jerome, when the deacon was styled a Levite (Ep. 27), do not belong to the church of St. Paul and Timothy. But there is nothing strange in the supposition, that a deacon of excellence in his calling should rise to the rank of presbyter. The custom, as it afterward obtained in the church, although it may have been by no means the rule of that early time, seems to have arisen naturally enough out of just such instances. Why should not such a promotion be καλός? and why should not one who had attained it have greater "boldness in the faith"? The opposite interpretation seems to us far-fetched and fantastic. See further, Ellicott and Wordsworth *in loco*.—W.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. It appears, from these precepts given to the deacons, how highly the Apostle valued the charge of the poor, which he would entrust only to those worthy of this special honor. All his directions may be called a practical commentary on two sayings of the Lord: "Woe to him through whom the offence cometh" (Matt. xviii. 6, 7); "Whoso is faithful in the least, is faithful also in much" (Luke xvi. 10). The Apostle in this, moreover, remains true to his own rule, that God is not "a God of confusion, but of peace," and therefore all must be "done decently and in order" (1 Cor. xiv. 33, 40).

2. The offices of deacon, presbyter, &c., in the apostolic church were not immediately ordained by Christ, and as little arranged by human wisdom after a predetermined and measured plan; but they came by degrees into existence, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit and in the process of circumstances, and were thus the source of rich blessing to many. They had from the first a spiritual character, the diaconate not excepted; for this office is very superficially valued, if we suppose it designed to meet the physical wants of the sick and poor. Here, rather, the beautiful saying is true: "The soul of charity is charity to the soul," Amalia Sieveking; and, "The service of the poor is the service of God," Angelus Merula. Hence such an office can be worthily exercised by those alone who are united truly with Christ and the brethren by the spirit of faith and love, and for Christ's sake ready to meet every sacrifice, every trial, and every opposition.

3. The apostolic directions regarding the office of presbyter and deacon have to the present time been far more truly kept in the Reformed Church than in the Lutheran; whilst in the Roman Church they have been caricatured, and are hardly to be recognized. It is from this common cause that the presbyterate and diaconate, in the life of the church, form, together with the office of preacher and pastor, a circle of working forces, whose rights and duties are still

too little understood and prized by many. Compare the "Manual for Elders and Deacons in the Evangelical Church, and those who are to become such," by G. B. LECHLER, Frankfort-on-the-Maine, 1857.

4. "It is beyond doubt that much is given to those who are entrusted with the office of elder or deacon. An office is given them of primitive Christianity, honorable by its antiquity, and at the same time evangelical, Protestant, of needful service for the edifying of the Christian body."

5. The apostolic rules regarding deacons remain, in spirit and substance, normative for all such officers; and a wholesome corrective for the many deviations from those principles which are seen to-day in manifold shapes.

6. See further, chap. iii. 1–7, and chap. v. 9 *et seq.*

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

How the diaconate must be exercised in the spirit of the Apostle Paul: (1.) Its duty; (2.) its requirement; (3.) its blessing.—Whoso would successfully watch over others, has double need to know his own condition.—The relation of a good servant of the church (1.) to honor; (2.) to pleasure; (3.) to the goods of the world.—The inward connection of a firm faith and a pure conscience.—Women may direct the work of Christ (1.) to great gain; (2.) to incalculable harm.—The church a family; its pastor a father of the household.—Connection between fidelity in the guidance of our own family and of that entrusted to us.—The laborer is worthy of his hire.—Faithful duty to the Lord the best way toward our own growth in holiness and grace.—Rectitude before God goes hand in hand with boldness before men.—Faith in Christ the spring of the true wisdom for life.—Whoso lacks the requirements of Paul, will not only be a poor deacon, but a poor Christian.

STARKE: HEDINGER: Pure doctrine and pure conscience must always go together. What worth in much knowledge, without self-knowledge? much teaching, without our own conversion?—None can be a true Christian, still less a teacher, who has not faith and a pure conscience.—STARKE: How needful proof, trial, experience, evidence, to those appointed to the spiritual office!—The more prominent the place God allots any one, the more blameless should be his life, since many observe him.—When all is well in the clergyman's home, there is a good example for his people; if not, it is a slaughter-house, where souls are destroyed (1 Sam. iii. 13).—The true servants of God do not mourn over their sweat and toil; if they stay here without further promotion, they will have a degree so much the higher in heaven (Dan. xii. 3; 1 Cor. xv. 41, 42).

HEUBNER: The strictest examination before our appointment to the spiritual office cannot equal the holy claims of the office.—Our whole life is indeed an examination followed by a judgment.—No office has such claim (?) to future honor and blessedness as that of the Christian teacher.—It is a strong spur to higher, Christian competition, when we remember that there are degrees even in salvation.

VON GERLACH: Fidelity in little is the test of genuine fidelity in great things.—Many are seemingly truer in the great concerns of life than in the less, where they constantly offend in their everyday faults, which all can see; and therefore such fidelity in greater things is worm-eaten, done from men-pleasing, from worldly ambition, not love to God and the brethren.—LISCO: The personal traits of the almoner of the church, ad vers. 1–15.—Characteristics of a good clergyman.—(*Synodal Sermon*): We have the richest and the hardest office in the communion of the Lord.

[DONNE, *Sermons:* The ministry to the poor. Heaven and earth are a musical instrument; if you touch a string below, the motion goes to the top. Any good done to Christ's poor members upon earth, affects Him in heaven.—W.]

VIII.

Weightiness of the preceding admonition for the Church.

CH. III. 14–16.

14 These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly:
15 But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how[1] thou oughtest [one ought]
to behave thyself [one's self] in the house of God, which is the church of the
16 living God, the pillar and ground of the truth. And without controversy, great
is the mystery of godliness: [,] God [Who] was manifest in the flesh, justified
in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the
world, received up into glory.

[1] Ver. 15.—How one (*wie man*). Some authorities—*e. g.*, D., Arm., Vulg., and others—have inserted σε, for the sake, it appears, of explanation, but for the rest, without reason.

[2] Ver. 16.—See the exegetical explanations. [There are difficulties here both in the proper reading and in the translation. ΟΣ is easily convertible into ΘΣ. In the Oriental Church the powerful Christological interest might easily have overlooked an alteration in the text, which was the result either of inadvertence, or of a design to give greater emphasis to the doctrine of the Incarnation here enunciated. We find that the reading in the Lectionaries, in Chrysostom, Theodoret, John of Damasc., Œcumenius, Theophylact, and others, was Θεός; but this was not the reading of the great uncial MSS. Bishop Pearson has an elaborate note upon this text ("Creed," Am. ed., p. 194), in which he assumes, however, that the "Greek copies" all read Θεὸς, which is an error. It is not denied that many of the Greek fathers read Θεὸς; the question is, what is the evidence that it is the true reading? The reader is referred to the

author's critical remarks.—Nor is the translation easy. Our author is ingenious here, but not convincing. He brackets the following words: ("*Ein Pfeiler und Grundfeste der Wahrheit, und anerkannt gross ist das Geheimniss der Gottseligkeit*") = "a pillar and ground of the truth, and confessedly great is the mystery of godliness." He *thus* connects the clause, "great is the mystery of godliness," with what precedes. It has, indeed, a connection with the foregoing, but not in the way of grammatical structure. We can, with the modern critical editors, place a full period at the end of the 15th verse. Then we can find the logical connection thus: the mystery of godliness is the truth just referred to; the especial substance of that "truth" is then expressed in the words that follow: "Who was manifest," &c. Yet ὃς creates the greatest difficulty in the way of structure. But it may (so Huther) be regarded as referring to a subject not yet named expressly, but which, of course, must be Christ. Then, if we regard the passage as taken from a current Christian hymn, the difficulty disappears in a measure.—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 14. **These things write I unto thee.** The Apostle does not mean here the whole Epistle, but only the admonitions which he has given in chaps. ii. and iii. Probably, before he parted from Timothy, he had left behind for him a general direction, but not special rules for each individual case. He now does this, **hoping**, &c. Ἐλπίζων does not mean the cause of his writing, but is to be taken *sensu adversativo, although I hope;* see WINER, p. 214.—**To come shortly;** properly, *sooner;* τάχιον, in comparative; *i. e.*, sooner than is expected, or perhaps than I think of. The various readings, ἐν τάχει, ταχεῖον, or ταχέως, are only expository corrections, against which we hold, *difficilior lectio præferenda;* for which reason Tischendorf has justly retained the *Recepta.* Besides, the comparative τάχιον, John xiii. 27, is used in almost the same sense with ταχύ.

Ver. 15. **But if I tarry long,** &c. It might happen that the expectation of Paul to return soon would be disappointed; and in order to prevent any embarrassment to Timothy, he writes him the necessary instructions. Βραδύνω, the same word used 2 Pet. iii. 9 of the promise of Christ's coming. That Paul will meet Timothy in Corinth, to go with him to Macedonia (Otto), is a conjecture, only forced on the text to favor a pet hypothesis.—**How thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God.** The expression has a general sense, although it apparently refers to Timothy in particular. The explanatory σε has this degree of weight (Luther, too, reads, *how thou shouldst behave*); but critically the evidence is too weak to admit it into the text. See Tischendorf on this passage.—Ἀναστρέφεσθαι means not Christian life in general, but here the life of the Christian officer, which belonged to Timothy and his fellow-episcopi. The scene of this ἀναστροφή is the house of God, the Christian community not exclusively in Ephesus, but in general.—*House of God,* οἶκος Θεοῦ. It is well known how frequently this scriptural expression occurs in the other letters of Paul; most strikingly 1 Cor. iii. 9-17. If the temple at Jerusalem, as well as Israel itself, the Old Testament people, bore this name (Matt. xxi. 13; Heb. iii. 2, 5), it might certainly be used with greater truth of the Church of the New Testament. It is the house whose owner is God, since He built it, inhabits it, and will complete it in His own way and time (comp. Lisco, "Parables of Jesus," 4th ed., p. 505). The conception of inward unity, as well as of indestructible steadfastness, is obviously expressed in this word. These attributes are possessed by the Christian church, because it is the house of the living God. Bengel's remark is deeply spiritual: "*Ecclesia Dei viventis opponitur fano Dianæ Ephesiorum. Vita Dei fundamentum spei nostræ,*" cap. iv. 10, *et fons veritatis, h. l.*—**Pillar and ground of the truth.** We have thus reached by degrees one of the most difficult passages in these Epistles. The words which are chiefly to be discussed offer nothing doubtful in a literal sense. Στύλος is the support on which the roof of a house rests, its upholding pillar (comp. Rev. iii. 12; Gal. ii. 9). Wahl says very truly: "*Omne id, cui ut primario et præ ceteris insigni innititur aliquid.*" Ἑδραίωμα means the ground, the foundation (comp. θεμέλιος, 2 Tim. ii. 19), which is as necessary for the stability of the whole house. *Pillar and ground of the truth* can only refer to the religious truth personally revealed and manifest in Christ. But now the question is, whether these words are in apposition to οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ ζῶντος just before, or belong to καὶ ὁμολογουμένως, κ.τ.λ., just following them. Both constructions have been often defended and attacked with alternate success by learned and devout men. In De Wette and Huther may be found the names of the various champions of either view. Here, where we do not aim at strict exegetical discussions, but rather to give the results of our own inquiries, we shall simply state why the latter view, as is seen in our translation, seems preferable to the former. The statement of Paul's design in the preceding portion is already closed with ver. 15; and while the description of the church as the house of the living God has a good and valid sense, the following phrase, "a pillar and ground of the truth," if it be considered as an addition to this figurative expression, is exceedingly dull and heavy. It is most improbable that the Apostle should in one breath describe the church, which he has called an οἶκος, as also a στῦλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα. We cannot possibly expect such a violation of all æsthetic rule from a man like Paul. The conception of the church as such a pillar and ground of the truth, is indeed quite explicable in a sound sense, yet it is in itself far from clear and as far from Pauline (comp. 1 Cor. iii. 11). But if the new proposition (ver. 16) begins with the words καὶ ὁμολ. μέγα, then the copulative καὶ is entirely without a purpose, and a singular commencement, too, of a proposition. We need not here recall the misuse made by Romish interpreters of the idea: "The church a pillar of the truth" (comp. Calvin on this passage). A striking view of this conception of the church, as *columna veritatis,* in the Protestant light, is given by Melanchthon on this sentence.—For all these reasons, we believe that we are right in beginning, with στῦλος, a new proposition, which continues to the end of the chapter. It must be granted that the construction remains singular and hard: στύλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον; especially the article τὸ had best be removed, if, according to our view, στῦλος . . . ἀληθ. is the predicate of τῆς εὐσεβ. μυστ. Yet we do not find this objection so overwhelming, as Grotius and others do, against our construction. The evolution of thought is rapid; the Apostle speaks so forcibly, that he does not painfully weigh and arrange his words. The representation of the ὃς ἐφαν., κ.τ.λ., in ver. 16, directly after, as not only a μυστήριον τῆς εὐσεβείας, but as likewise a στύλος κ. ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας, the denial and opposition to

which is fully noticed chap. iv. 1, is entirely in the Apostle's spirit; who, as we know already in earlier letters, gives a special importance to the essentials of the gospel. If a new chapter had been begun with the words, "a pillar and ground of the truth," the whole connection would perhaps have been viewed in another light. The interpretation of *στύλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθ.* as referring solely to Timothy, deserves scarcely any notice save as an exegetical oddity. To exhort a pillar to behave itself (*ἀναστρέφεσθαι*), sounds a little hyperbolical. Only three of the foremost Apostles are called *στύλοι*, Gal. ii. 9; but never their associates.

Ver. 16. **And without controversy great,** &c., *Καὶ ὁμολογ. μέγα, κ.τ.λ.* This must, as *στύλος καὶ ἑδρ.*, be regarded as the introduction of the summary statement *ὃς ἐφανερ., κ.τ.λ.* *Μυστήριον* is the Pauline expression for that truth, before hidden, now brought to light (see Eph. iii. 3–5); *μυστ. τῆς εὐσεβείας*, that which is the object of *εὐσεβ.*, like *μυστ. τ. πίστ.* (ver. 9); whence it appears that the translation, *a godly mystery* (Luther), is somewhat arbitrary. This mystery is great, not wholly unfathomable (comp. Matt. xiii. 12), deep in meaning, weighty (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 11), confessedly great, *ὁμολογουμένως*; not strictly, made known (Luther), but rather in the sense of indubitable, *secundum id quod in confesso est apud omnes. Summa;* a mystery now revealed, whose weight and worth no Christian can doubt. What, now, is this mystery? The very thing called *στύλος κ. ἑδραίωμα τ. ἀλ.* The phrase lacks, indeed, in a degree, the climax which we might here expect; but this difficulty vanishes when we balance against it the fact that the Apostle has expressed his meaning first in a tropic, then in a literal mode; whilst the following clauses show now in their order what the subject is which was called *improprie* a pillar and ground, *proprie* a mystery of godliness. The remark of Wiesinger, following Schleiermacher, that the third adjective of definition, *ὁμολογ. μέγα*, cannot grammatically be connected with two predicates like *στύλος* and *ἑδραίωμα*, seems to us at least without any proof. [The reference of the "pillar and ground" to the church, is more strongly sustained by exegetical argument, both by writers of older and later times, than this view of our author. Huther, Schleiermacher, and Wiesinger, among many, hold the grammatical construction to point to *ἐκκλησία*. Alford has perhaps summed the evidence as concisely as any of our English expositors; and in his view the structure of the whole passage demands this application. His answer to the chief objection offered by our commentator, on the score of good taste, seems sufficient, viz., that the *οἶκος* contains in itself pillar and basement. Conybeare is one of the few who apply the phrase to Timothy; but this sense seems frigid, and unworthy of this great passage. There is a striking suggestion of Arnold, which may well be added: "If the words are to be applied to the church, they do not describe what it is *de facto*, but what it ought to be. Take care that no error through thy fault creep into that church, which was designed by God to be nothing but a pillar and basis of truth;" "Life and Letters," p. 31, v. 2, Amer. ed.—W.] —**God was manifest in the flesh [Who was manifest in the flesh,** in the German version]. The translation given above expresses already our probable judgment on this well-known *crux criticorum.* We can with a good critical conscience wholly agree with the steadily increasing number who regard neither *Θεός* nor *ὅ*, but *ὅς*, as the original reading. See Tischendorf, N. T., ed. 7, on this passage; and compare the very valuable *Excursus aa 1 Tim. iii.* 16 in his edition of the *Codex Ephr Syri rescriptus*, 1843. The *Codex Sinaiticus* has also confirmed the reading *ὅς* as the only true one. Paul might, indeed, from his Christological standpoint, have very justly written *Θεός*; but it does not at all follow that he has done so. It is hardly credible that the original reading *Θεός* should have been changed to *ὅς*; but very explicable that the original *ὅς* should have been changed to *Θεός*. Were *Θεός* the true reading (Matthäi, Scholz, Rinck), it would be passing strange that such decisive proof-texts should never have been used by the orthodox church fathers in the Arian and other controversies; and, again, Cyril, in his reply to the Emperor Julian, who denied that Paul had ever called Christ *Θεός*, has not appealed in a word to this passage, as he would almost surely have done had he known the *Lectio Recepta.* Besides, we find in the following clauses several expressions (*e. g.*, *ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις* and *ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ*) which could hardly be used of God absolutely, but only of the *Θεὸς φανερωθείς.* For all these reasons, the reading *ὅς* is not only critically but exegetically proved to be best; and the view often expressed, that it is an heretical corruption of the text, is quite exploded. To the question, whether we should supply an *οὗτος* after *ὅς* before *ἐδικαιώθη*, or whether all the clauses following this refer to a subject not further named in ver. 16, we must answer by the latter opinion. The designation of the *μυστ. τ. εὐσεβ.* has the character of a proposition, to which the *apodosis* is wanting; and this fragmentary style of the whole expression confirms yet more the conjecture, based on the metrical sequence of the words, and already affirmed by many, that we have here a part of an ancient Christian hymn. The unnamed subject of the proposition in ver. 16 can be only Christ; and although the reading *Θεός*, in our view, is not critically justified, the passage still contains, by the reading *ὅς ἐφανερώθη*, a proof indirect but unquestionable of the Divine-human nature and dignity of the Lord. *Manifest in the flesh* can only be said of Him who, before His incarnation, was personally with the Father. Nay, more; it is possible to keep the reading *ὅς*, with Tischendorf, yet avoid all the difficulties which might possibly come from a surrender of the *Recepta*, if we consider the clause, *Στύλος κ. ἑδρ. . . . μυστήριον*, as a long parenthesis, and thus read the text, vers. 15, 16: "*Ἵνα εἰδῇς πῶς δεῖ ἐν οἴκῳ Θεοῦ ἀναστρέφεσθαι ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ ζῶντος (στύλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον!) ὅς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, κ.τ.λ.*" This conjecture appears to us the simplest and most natural in the treatment of a passage so often interpreted and misinterpreted. If it be true, then the reading *Θεός* is critically untenable; yet it is a right exposition of the Apostle's meaning, since *ὅς* reverts directly to *Θεοῦ ζῶντος.* That the Apostle often uses long parentheses, appears, among several instances, from Rom. ii. 13–15. That he does it here, will seem less extraordinary when we consider the fulness and rapid succession of thoughts in this part of his letter. We readily grant, moreover, that objections may be raised against this view by those especially who regard *στύλος κ. ἑδραίωμα* as in apposition with *ἐκκλησία τ. Θεοῦ ζῶντος.* But this last view seems to us unsustained; and thus the only question is, in the choice

of the many expositions, which has the fewest difficulties? We have from our point of view the double advantage, that we need neither violate our critical conscience, nor surrender a *dictum probans* for the divinity of Christ.—**Manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit.** Six connected clauses, which, in the original especially, have a very euphonic and metrical character.—*Manifest in the flesh.* Man is flesh; the Son of God is manifest in the flesh, since He came forth from the Father, with whom He personally pre-existed (1 John i. 2). The birth of the Lord is the starting-point of this manifestation; its scene His whole earthly life. Bengel: "*Hæc manifestatio dicit totam occonomiam Christi, oculis quondam mortalium conspicui.*" If the excellence of this Divine manifestation is misjudged and despised by many, yet God has confirmed it in the most undoubted way. Ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι; He is proved to be the very Person He truly was (for this sense of justified, comp. Luke vii. 35). He is by His divine glory known ἐν πνεύματι, not as Spirit (Baur), but in the Spirit, whereby this His δικαίωσις is effected. The Spirit who dwells and works in Him, not by measure (John iii. 34), and raised Him at last from the dead (Rom. i. 3, 4), reveals Him in His high nature and dignity. We have here, without any arbitrary severance of the connection, a reference to all by which His divine origin is made known (comp. John i. 14). In what way has this wondrous announcement of this wondrous manifestation been given? Paul answers in the two following clauses.—**Seen of angels,** ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις; not the Apostles, which would not be the common use of the word, but the angels of heaven, who often ministered to Him in the days of His humiliation (Matt. iv. 11; Luke xxii. 43), and to whom, after His resurrection, He revealed Himself in His godlike glory. The power of Christ over these heavenly beings is not here meant (Mack), but the vision of His glory by those who wonder at the brightness which they have never before seen, or at least not in such perfection. Comp. 1 Pet. i. 12; Eph. iii. 10; Heb. i. 6. Chrysostom: "Ὥστε καὶ ἄγγελοι μεθ' ἡμῶν εἶδον τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, πρότερον οὐχ ὁρῶντες." "He alludes probably to a heavenly scene, the contrast of the descent into hell;" De Wette. If we take Θεός as the subject of this clause, we may perhaps find expressed here the thought, that God, through His manifestation in Christ, has been revealed in a higher light before the angels. Whatever the truth of this, He who has thus revealed Himself in heaven, has not been forgotten on earth.—**Preached unto the Gentiles.** Ἔθνη., in a general sense, implying that the nations have received, through the preaching of the gospel, the same truth which the angels received by vision—the glory of Christ, the Lord. Wiesinger justly says: "It is a new commandment to both; and the mystery lies in this union of heaven and earth around His person, in this wonderful blending of such entire opposites." It is not the contrast between Jew and heathen, but between human and superhuman beings, which the Apostle directly regards.—The third couplet denotes, finally, the results of this whole manifestation, and its announcement. It had not been in vain. It was **believed on in the world,** ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ. This last word must be here taken in an ethical sense, quite like 1 John ii. 15; v. 19. Amidst the multitude of those who reject Him, the Son of God has found faith with many where He has been preached (comp. 2 Thess. i. 10); and is finally **received up into glory,** ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ. It is the most natural view to refer this to the ascension of the Lord (comp. Luke xxiv. 40, 51); nor is it any insuperable difficulty that the foregoing clauses in part allude to a period after His ascension, since the Apostle does not design to give a chronological view of the events in the life of Jesus. Meanwhile, we need not refer this last clause (ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ) to the ascension exclusively, any more than the first (ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί) to the nativity of Christ. We may embrace in the conception His whole heavenly life in glory, taking the expression *per attractionem;* ἀνελήφθη εἰς δόξαν, καὶ ἐστὶν ἐν δόξῃ. Calvin: "*Ergo sicuti in mundo quoad fidei obedientiam ita et in Christo personâ mira fuit conversio, dum ex tam abjectâ servi conditione erectus est ad dexteram Patris, ut illi flectatur omne genu.*" The three couplets thus bring before our vision the advancing glory of this Divine manifestation in Christ in a series of acts, whose beginning is the earth, whose closing is in heaven. It may appear, perhaps, an incidental feature, that the whole consists of two chief divisions, of which earth has two subdivisions; the first two embracing the events on earth, the third those of heaven (Huther). In any case, Paul has not arranged this division in such an order by any arbitrary rule of art. We probably, therefore, have, as already suggested by Winer, Wiesinger, De Wette, Huther, and others, in this whole passage the fragment of an ancient church hymn (as Eph. v. 14), or a symbol of faith, which, when the praise τοῦ Θεοῦ ζῶντος was sung, perhaps in some strophe, no longer known to us, may have been as follows

Ὃς—μέγα τὸ μυστήριον—
ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί,
ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι,
ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις,
Ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν,
ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ,
ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ.

All this is, in the Apostle's view, the great mystery of godliness—the pillar and ground of the truth, on which the house of God (ver. 14) rests unshaken; and it is an apostasy from this in the bosom of the same church to which he looks forward (chap. iv. 1). Compare Rambach, "Anthology of Christian Hymns in all Ages of the Church," i. p. 33, *et seq.*

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The tone in which the Apostle here speaks to his friend and scholar Timothy, and the deference which he expects in the performance of his instructions, give us a fresh proof of his apostolic authority.

2. The tabernacle and temple of the old covenant, in which it is said that God dwelt in a special manner, were a type of the Christian Church with all its blessings; and Israel, the people of the elder revelation, a pattern of the kingly and priestly race of the new covenant.

3. It is the essential character of Christianity, that it does not rest on abstract conceptions, and inferences of reason, but on undeniable and changeless facts (1 John i. 1–3). The whole sum of the Christian revelation is in the person and history of its Founder, which the Apostle here condenses in a

few words. Each new proposition which he offers opens a new world of Divine wisdom and love. The creed here recorded is not the confession of particular churches, but of the one holy, catholic Church of Christ in all centuries; the oldest *formula concordiæ*—the standard of the true Church against the unbelieving world, on which a higher hand has written, ***in hoc signo vinces.***

4. The preceding words are most important, as clearly explaining to us the meaning of the *μυστήριον*. The older theology considered mysteries as dogmas, which lie wholly beyond and above the sphere of men, which are to all eternity unsearchable to the finite understanding, and therefore best veiled in a holy obscurity. Paul does not acknowledge many mysteries; he knows *one* only great mystery, whose chief truth is here revealed; and this is its specific characteristic, that it was before hid, but is now manifest. Yet there is no ground in such a view for the position of modern rationalism, that this mystery, now revealed, may be completely apprehended by man. Even a revealed mystery has its dark, hidden side. The sun, which has been long veiled by the clouds, and suddenly breaks forth in its full light, blinds the eyes as truly as the darkness. "*Mysteria quantumvis revelata, vel sic tamen obscura manent*" (comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 11, 12). When Paul presents the mystery as the object of the *εὐσέβεια*, he indirectly reproves their arrogance, who think with their bounded understanding to search the deep things of God, instead of keeping them in the sanctuary of a holy heart.

5. This confession of faith is only the fuller exposition of the testimony which the Lord (John xvi. 28) gave of Himself. The last words should not be overlooked, in which the question is answered, whether Paul taught or no the bodily ascension of the Lord Jesus.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Paul a pattern of tireless apostolic activity in speech and writing.—Timothy, however rich in spiritual gifts, yet in his church duties directed by the authority of Paul.—The minister of the gospel must above all know how to behave himself in the house of God.—The Church of Christ a house of the living God: (1.) Builded of God; (2.) inhabited by God; (3.) consecrated by God; (4.) completed through God.—The greatest blessings of the old covenant are not lost in the new, but lavished in fuller measure.—The manifest mystery of the grace of God in Christ the essential fact we have in Christianity.—The personal, historic, living Christ the ground of His Church.—God's glory in Christ: (1.) *Manifest*; (2.) declared; (3.) crowned with the desired success.—The Divine manifestation: (1.) A mystery; (2.) a mystery which passeth knowledge; (3.) a mystery which the godly alone can understand and prize, and which alone can lead to godliness.—The marvellous facts of the gospel history a chain, in which not a link is wanting.—From these facts the preaching of the gospel must proceed, and to it constantly return.—The minister of the gospel is not called to declare to the church the religious ideas of his time, but God's eternal truths of redemption and salvation.

STARKE: ANTON: A Christian minister must not sit always in his study, but must go hither and thither.—HEDINGER: The Church may fail, but not fall. —ANTON: Behold the Church directly in your sight What it is in God's eyes, let it be in yours.—*Μυστήριον*. This mystery is great: (1.) In its origin, for it comes from the inconceivably and inexpressibly great love of the heavenly Father; (2.) in its own character, for who can think or know how it is possible for One greater than all angels, yea, equal to the Father in power and glory, to have been manifest in the flesh; (3.) in its purpose, which is the salvation of lost men, lying in the utmost ruin.—THE SAME: The gospel is full of mystery; it must be judged not by the reason, but by God's revelation (2 Cor. x. 5).—Preachers, who carry into the pulpit an empty babble, which leads not to godliness, are not gospel teachers (chap. i. 4; iv. 7).—The mystery of the incarnation of the Son of God, received in faith and shown in godliness, leads to eternal glory (chap. iv. 10; Acts xvi. 30, 31).—HEUBNER: Each Christian community must be a community of the living God.—All Christians must agree in the essential truth of the Christian faith.—Christianity is the holiest and worthiest revelation of God.—The spread of the gospel is an outward enlargement of the glory of Jesus; the greater the number of His worshippers, the greater His kingdom.

LISCO: The inmost kernel of the Christian doctrine of salvation.—The confessedly great and blessed mystery of the Incarnation: (1.) A mystery; (2.) the godly power which renews our life.

[BISHOP HALL, "Mystery of Godliness:" He that should have seen Thee, O Saviour, working in Joseph's shop, or walking in the fields of Nazareth, would have looked upon Thee as mere man; neither thy garb nor countenance betrayed any difference in Thee from ordinary men. It was Thine all-working and co-essential Spirit, by whose mighty operations Thy divinity was made known to the world.

BISHOP ANDREWES, *Resp. ad Bellarminum*, ch. 14: We reject not the voice of the Church; nay, we all do venerate it. But the Church to us meaneth not the Pontiff, or the Roman *curia;* nor, unless you have so prejudged it in your mind, will this title of the Church much advantage you. It is *the pillar of the truth*, yea, verily; not that the truth is sustained by it, but itself by the truth. This pillar truly hangeth not in the air; it hath a basis: but where, save in the word of God?—W.]

IX.

Warning against errorists, and exhortation to bear himself against them as a good soldier of Jesus Christ.—Description and in part confutation of the errorists.

CH. IV. 1–5.

1 Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart
from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; [,]
2 Speaking lies in[1] hypocrisy; [,] having their [own] conscience seared with a
3 hot iron; [,] Forbidding to marry, *and commanding* to abstain from meats,
which God hath created to be received [for participation] with thanksgiving
of them [in or upon the part of them] which believe and know [acknowledge]
4 the truth. For every creature of God *is* good, and nothing to be refused, if it
5 be received with thanksgiving: For it is sanctified by the word of God, and
prayer.

Ver. 2.—[Whitby translates ἐν, instrumentally = διά. "Through the hypocrisy of liars." He appears to connect the phrase with προσέχοντες; so Wiesinger and Huther. The construction is difficult, several words being in apparent apposition with δαιμονίων, as if the devils were *liars*, *seared* in their conscience, and the rest. He would be a bold commentator who would maintain that the Apostle here calls heretics devils. Yet, in Phil. iii. 2, he writes, "Beware of dogs."—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **Now the Spirit speaketh expressly.** The Spirit of prophecy is denoted, which under the new covenant also continues to speak and to work. The question whether this means a revelation of the Spirit in the mind of Paul, or an announcement received by him from others—in other words, whether a direct or an indirect prophecy should here be understood—can only be left to conjecture. From Acts xvi. 6; xx. 23, it appears that the one as well as the other existed in the first age of Christianity; besides, the writings of the Old Testament, as well as many words of our Lord Himself, gave sufficient ground to the Apostle to predict, in the tone of firm conviction, a coming apostasy. To the inquiry why he clothes this warning in the form of a prophetic oracle, Calvin gives the correct answer: "*Quo majore attentione excipiant omnes, quod dicturus est, præfatur certum esse et minime obscurum oraculum Spiritus Sancti. Non est quidem dubium, quia reliqua ex eodem Spiritu hauserit, verum utcumque semper audiendus sit tanquam Christi organum, tamen in causa magni ponderis, voluit hoc testatum, nihil se proferre, nisi ex spiritu prophetiæ. Solemni itaque præconio nobis hanc prophetiam commendat, nec eo contentus, addit, esse claram nec ullo ænigmate implicitam.*"—**In the latter times.** Altogether undetermined; ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς; not, ἐν ἐσχάτοις καιρ. (2 Tim. iii. 1). Not the period which immediately precedes the advent of the Lord, but the advent in general, is here denoted, whose first development the Apostle already discerned in the circle around him.—**Some.** The heretics themselves are not designated (Matthies, Heinrichs), but members of the church who might be misled by the heretics, as appears from the following.—**Depart from the faith** (comp. Luke viii. 13; 2 Tim. ii. 18). "*Vera negando, falsa addendo;*" Bengel.—**Giving heed to seducing spirits.** Here, as frequently, the cause of the phenomenon is indicated by a participial connective. The whole discussion in the beginning of this chapter forms, too, a formal antithesis to chap. iii. 15, 16, as is shown in ver. 1 of this chapter by the diminutive δέ.—*Seducing spirits*, πνεύμασι πλάνοις, are not the heretics themselves, but the evil spirits or powers which inspire them, and which are counted tools of the devil himself (comp. Eph. ii. 2; vi. 12). This is evident, too, from what immediately follows: **and doctrines of devils.** This latter expresses still more exactly the conception generally denoted by the preceding πνεύμασι. These heresics have sprung from such demons—were inspired and spread by them. From 1 Cor. x. 20 it appears that the Apostle considered these demons as personal powers ruling in heathendom, and hostile to Christ.

Ver. 2. **In hypocrisy,** ἐν ὑποκρίσει. This verse has been connected with the preceding in various ways (see De Wette on this passage). It seems best to refer the words directly back to προσέχοντες (Wiesinger, Huther). Just as this προσέχειν was the cause of the apostasy, so the ὑποκρίσις was the cause of the προσέχειν; here, therefore, the error of the understanding had a psychological ground in the state of the corrupt heart. "The hypocrisy of the heretics lay in this, that, giving allegiance to such a spiritualism (ver. 3), they had the appearance of a real spiritual life" (Huther).—**Speaking lies,** ψευδολόγοι (ἁπ. λεγόμ.), ψευδοπροφήτης (2 Pet. ii. 1), and thus still more severe than the ματαιολόγοι (chap. i. 6).—**Having their conscience seared,** κεκαυτηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν; that is, those who, like criminals branded for crime, bore in their own consciousness the mark of their guilt. Others with less probability explain it thus; their conduct has been such, that their consciences have by degrees become seared against all moral and holy influences. Καυτηριάζειν (*cauteris notare*) was done not only to slaves, but to criminals, who were known to be such by the brand on the forehead. It was thus with the heretics, *qui sauciam scelerum conscientia habent mentem* (Wahl). This insensibility was, without doubt, a natural consequence; yet this is not exactly the meaning of the

Apostle. While they profess to lead others to a true holiness, they bear in their own conscience (ἰδίαν) the brand of guilt and shame.

Ver. 3. **Forbidding to marry.** As the Essenes and Therapeutæ had before done (comp. JOSEPH., *A. J.*, 14, 2, and PHILO, *De vita contemplativa*). According to later Gnostic principles, also, marriage and begetting children were wrong, because the condition of marriage was looked upon as an institution of the Demiurge; and because, in this way, souls pure and innocent in a former state were imprisoned in impure bodies, and, by union with corrupt matter, became sinful and wretched. The germs of this tendency existed already in the day of Paul, as is clear from the Epistle to the Colossians. The Apostle continued even to the end of his life in conflict with this error.—**And [commanding] to abstain from meats.** See other examples of an ellipse, such as occurs here, in 1 Cor. xiv. 34; 1 Tim. ii. 12. How strongly the earliest Gnosticism insisted on this, is plain from Col. ii. 16. Later, Manichæus held that wine sprang from the blood and gall of the devil. Perhaps the food here designated is only meat (comp. Rom. xiv. 2, 21). The command probably arose from the Gnostic fancy, that the materials which nourished the body were not the work of the Most High God, but of the Demiurgus, and thus from the evil principle, the ὕλη of Satan. The absurdity of this notion Paul clearly shows in what follows.

[Much light is yet to be thrown by Oriental researches on the heresies alluded to in the Epistles of the New Testament. Yet, so far as these Pastoral Epistles are concerned, there is nothing to sustain the view of Baur, who would disprove their Pauline origin by referring these passages to the later Gnostics; but it seems clear that they describe the earlier Jewish errorists of the church. A collation of passages will prove this. 1 Tim. i. 7, they are teachers of the law. Titus i. 10, deceivers of the circumcision. *Id.* v. 14, Jewish fables. *Id.* iii. 9, genealogies are classed with strivings about the law. If, again, we study the errors themselves, we shall find them connected with notions of the Jewish schools. Our author has cited from Josephus and Philo the peculiar tenets of the Essenes. We must, however, correct one of his references. The book of PHILO, *Omnis probus liber*, gives a sketch of the *practical* Essenes, who are nearer to the type than the Therapeutæ of the "*Vita contemplativa.*" Abstinence from marriage and meats formed the distinctive marks of this and kindred ascetic sects; 1 Tim. iv. 1-3. The *genealogies*, 1 Tim. i. 4; Titus iii. 10, are as fully explained by the Jewish fables of angelic hierarchies, as by the Æons of the later Gnostics.—See NICOLAS, *Doctr. relig. d. Juifs*, c. 2, p. 88; c. 3, p. 234. The translation of the *Avesta* by SPIEGEL has cast fresh light on the Persian origin of the Jewish angelology. *Einleitung*, c. 2. Lastly, the doctrine ascribed to Hymeneus, 2 Tim. ii. 18, has its root in the Essenian idea of the resurrection of the soul from carnal ignorance to the life of the spiritual man. NICOLAS, c. 2, p. 88. See also, for an admirable summary of the whole argument, SCHAFF, "Apost. Church," B. 5, c. 3, and the account of Gnosticism in general, in his "Church History," vol. i. p. 221. It is true, as was said by older scholars like Prideaux, long before Baur and Reuss, that no direct trace of the Essene school is visible in the age of the New Testament. Yet it is not of Essenism as a distinct sect, but of its ideas and tendencies we speak, and these unquestionably had largely leavened the Hebrew mind. All the strange mixtures of Eastern and Greek theosophy had their influence on the later Jewish culture, and the Christian Gnosticism was only the ripening of the germs then planted in the church.—W.]

Ver. 3. **Which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving,** εἰς μετάληψιν μετὰ εὐχαριστίας = ἵνα οἱ π., κ.τ.λ., μεταλαβῶσιν αὐτῶν. For the participation, the acceptance, and enjoyment of His own creatures, God in the beginning ordained food, and human prohibition is thus purely wilful.—*With thanksgiving.* This added clause meets the conceit, that the Apostle gives an unbridled freedom —a freedom that so easily leads to excess. Enjoyment with thanksgiving must *eo ipso* be moderate and seemly, as befits those who believe and know the truth. The πιστοί are, in the Apostle's view, the true γνωστικοί. As to the main thought expressed in this restriction, we recall the words of Calvin: "*Paulum de usu licito hic agere, cujus ratio coram Deo nobis constat. Hujus minime compotes sunt impii, propter impuram conscientiam, quæ omnia contaminat, quemadmodum habetur ad Titum i. 15. Et sane proprie loquendo, solis filiis suis Deus totum mundum et quidquid in mundo est destinavit, qua ratione etiam vocantur mundi hæredes.*"

Ver. 4. **For every creature of God is good.** As the previous verse has shown us Paul's fidelity to the position of genuine Christian freedom, which he holds also in the Epistles to the Romans and the Corinthians, so here, according to his usual custom in the discussion of a special case, he utters a universal principle. This is an internal evidence of the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles, which should not be overlooked.—Κτίσμα, creature, a created thing; while elsewhere, with Paul, κτίσις occurs in a passive sense. Naturally the word is to be understood here of those κτίσματα which are specially made for our nourishment. Comp. Rom. iv. 14, 20; Acts x. 15.—Καλὸν, good, suited to its end, healthful. In and for itself, no food is objectionable, yet on condition that it be used with thanksgiving to God.

Ver. 5. **For it is sanctified,** Ἁγιάζεται γάρ. The ground of the preceding. The sense is: it is set apart as food holy and well-pleasing to God (comp. Lev. xix. 24). In itself, the food is not holy, nor is it at all unholy, but mere matter. Yet it can be raised to a higher rank, to that of things consecrated to God; and it really becomes such **by the word of God, and prayer.** By the *word of God* is meant not a special passage of Scripture, *e. g.*, Gen. i. 29 (Mack), nor a Divine command in the general sense (Matthies), nor the prayer itself, which is offered to God (Leo, Wahl), since this would be tautological; but most probably the word of God uttered in and with the ἔντευξις named in addition. The customary prayer at the table probably consisted of words of holy Scripture; or the person praying should be regarded as speaking by the Spirit, and thus with the word of God. For an example of such a prayer at table, see Huther on this passage. [One of the most beautiful models of the primitive "Grace before meat" is cited by CONYBEARE from the *Apost. Constitut.*, 7, 49. We translate it here: "Blessed be Thou, O Lord, who hast fed me from my youth, who givest food to all flesh. Fill our hearts with joy and gladness, that, having always what sufficeth, we may abound unto all good works, in Christ Jesus our Lord, through whom be unto Thee honor, glory, and power, forever and ever. Amen."—W.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. As the gospel is the fulfilment of the prophecy of the Old Testament, it contains also predictions of those great events which precede the second coming of the Lord. The Lord Himself had already declared that false prophets also should then arise (Matt. xxiv. 11): "*Etsi omnia sæcula inde usque ab initio generis humani multas magnas confusiones religionum, bella et vastationes habuerunt, tamen vox divina sæpe testatur in ultima senecta mundi majores futuras esse confusiones, quam fuerunt antea. Et crescunt mala propter tres causas. Prima, quia cumulatis malis sequuntur majores pœnæ. Secunda, in his ipsis peccatis et pœnis natura fit languidior et disciplina dissolutior. Tertia, quia rabies diabolorum crescit, qui jam scientes instare diem judicii, odio filii Dei magis sæviunt in Ecclesiam;*" Melanchthon.

2. While the heretics, opposed by Paul in the Epistle to Titus, are regarded as then present, he speaks of them in both the Epistles to Timothy in a more prophetic tone. Even then his prediction, though rooted in the present, reaches on to the far future. The errors here opposed are only the germs of those which in the course of centuries reveal themselves continually in new and varied forms; and which, though not at all exclusively, appear in the papacy. The Reformers consequently asserted the truth, but not the whole truth, when they found in ver. 3 a distinct description of the erring mother-church. Such phenomena may be regarded as among the many signs, although not the highest reach of Antichrist. Already in the second century the heresies, here opposed, appeared in their first strength, and the whole sickly asceticism of the middle ages is only a variation of the theme here treated by the Apostle. [Thus LATIMER, "Sermons," ed. Parker Soc., p. 162: "Here learn to abhor the abominable opinion of the Papists, who hold that marriage is not an holy thing, and that the minister of the word of God be defiled through marriage, which is clean against God and His Word. Therefore, seeing beforehand in the Spirit, St. Paul saith, 1 Tim. iv. 3, which prophecy is verified in this our time." The stout old Reformer had no nice criticism of the text; but he saw the real identity of the false principle in the Jewish-Christian asceticism, and that of the later Latin monkery.—W.]

3. Between the two cliffs of spiritualism and materialism we see the bark of the Church continually tossed hither and thither in the course of the centuries. It has scarcely escaped the one, when it runs into peril of being stranded on the other. In our time, with the prevailing love of pleasure and luxury, there seems little danger of such severe morality as Paul here describes. But will there not be, sooner or later, a necessary reaction? and does not history clearly show that one extreme leads to the opposite?

4. It is a sad evidence of the blindness and pride of the sinner, that, when God has freed him by grace from a law that can only condemn him, he will not rest until he has again put himself under the yoke of a law fashioned by himself. So eager are we to build up a righteousness of our own before God, so loth simply to be blessed by free grace. Self-righteousness always remains the fond idol of the natural man; nor does he perceive that he must thus fall into new and worse unrighteousness.

5. The perfect law of liberty (James i. 26) has annulled the letter of the Mosaic command in regard to meats and drinks for the Christian man, and he needs no longer agree with those who say, "Thou shalt not handle that, thou shalt not taste that, thou shalt not touch that" (Col. ii. 21). But this very emancipation from the letter of the law is the best fulfilment of its spirit and substance; for when the Christian sanctifies all God's gifts through prayer and thanksgiving, all food becomes pure, even that which under the old Levitical code was unclean. Thus Christian freedom is not a passport for license, but the best bulwark against it.

6. "The special design of every outward gift of God is to lead to the knowledge and praise of the Giver; to lead from the earthly and temporal to the heavenly and eternal. As this design of God is not fulfilled in the unbelieving, if they continue in unbelief, He has in this view made all these things not for them, but for His children who know the truth;" Von Gerlach.

7. The dark visions which Paul opens to us of the future, directly conflict with the optimistic and sanguine hopes of those who believe that, from the unceasing growth of knowledge, all on earth and in the Church of Christ is becoming always better, more harmonious, more peaceful. The same Scripture which gives the promise of the last glorious day for the Christian, utters its ever-increasing lamentations over the last times which are to precede that day. Yet without the pains of travail, and σκάνδαλα in the ὑστέροις καιροῖς, the full glory of the ἐσχάτῃ ὥρα cannot break forth.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The prophecy of the New Testament the continuation and crown of the Old.—The prophetic character of the New Testament.—When God builds a church, the devil builds a chapel hard by.—The weeds in the Lord's garden do not grow slower than the wheat.—The diabolical feature in the heresies of the Church.—False spirituality not rarely the cloak of immorality.—A forced celibacy the devil's mask.—"Is this the fast which I have chosen?" (Isa. lviii. 5).—True and false asceticism.—True Christian freedom likewise the highest restraint.—The high purpose for which God created food.—Passing enjoyment a chosen aid to lead us to the abiding good.—"All things are yours, but ye are Christ's" (1 Cor. iii. 21–23).—The sanctity and worth of grace at table.—To glorify God even in the little things of domestic life, the Christian's honor, duty, and blessing.

STARKE: Great comfort, that God has revealed to His poor Church what is to come, that it may have the less cause to complain.—CRAMER: The devil always finds his followers; and it is vain to hope that in this world all religious strife shall cease.—ANTON: Whoso will shun false spirits, must first beware of his own spirit.—False teachers use for their craft hypocrisy, and the appearance of sanctity; they go about in sheep's clothing, and inwardly are ravening wolves (Matt. vii. 15; xxiii. 28).—If every creature of God be good, it is godless for the Papist exorcists to pretend to cast out the devil from water, salt, and oil, and, by certain passes with the cross, and conjurations, drive him away.—HEDINGER: If food should be received with thanksgiving, then man must not seek his bread by extortion,

cheat, theft, and the like; for no one can give thanks for these.—LUTHER (in his "Larger Catechism") teaches that "marriage is not to be esteemed lightly or scornfully, as the blind world and our false spiritual guides do, but is to be regarded according to God's word, whereby it is ma ie fair and holy; so that it is not only set on a level with all other estates, but is honored before and above them all; wherefore both spiritual and secular estates must humble themselves, and all accept this estate."—HEUBNER: The devout spirit, enlightened by God, may often have glimpses of the future, so far as it is of importance for the present.—The corruptions and discords of Christianity are allowed by God for manifold reasons.—All that God made is in itself good; only through man's distrust it becomes evil. The Christian knows how to sanctify even his own pleasures.—The unholy and the holy enjoyment of the gifts of God.—LISCO: The contradiction of all mere outward restraints imposed by man, to the witness of the revelation of God in Christ.

X.

Stirring exhortation for Timothy to genuine steadfastness in his Christian calling, and to continuous growth in it.

CH. IV. 6-16.

6 If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a
good minister of Jesus Christ[1] [Christ Jesus], nourished up in the words of
[the] faith and of good doctrine, whereunto thou hast attained [which thou hast
7 followed]. But refuse profane and old wives' fables, and exercise thyself *rather*
8 unto godliness. For bodily exercise profiteth little:[2] but godliness is profitable
unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to
9 come. This *is* a faithful saying [Faithful is the word], and worthy of all[3]
10 acceptation. For therefore [To this end] we both labor and suffer reproach[4]
[strive = ἀγωνιζόμεϑα], because we trust in the living God who is the Saviour
11 of all men, especially of those that believe. These things command and teach.
12 Let no man despise thy youth; [,] but be thou an example of the believers, in
13 word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit,[5] in faith, in purity. Till I come,
14 give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine [instruction]. Neglect
not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying
15 on of the hands of the presbytery. Meditate upon these things [Care for,
&c.]; [,] give thyself wholly to them;[6] [,] that thy profiting may appear to
16 all.[7] Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine [instruction]; continue in
them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee.[8]

[1] Ver. 6.—The received text has "Jesus Christ;" see Tischendorf. The Sinaiticus also confirms the omission. [I think there is some slip here; the question is of the proper order of the words. The *Recepta* reads, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; all the authorities, and modern cri ical editors, *transpose*, and read, Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.—E. H.]

[2] Ver 8.—[The Sinaiticus omits πρὸς before ὀλίγον.—E H.]

[3] Ver. 9.—[The Sinaiticus omits πάσης before ἀποδοχῆς.—E. H.]

[4] Ver. 10.—[*Recepta*, ὀνειδιζόμεθα; Lachmann, on the authority of A. C., has ἀγωνιζόμεθα; so Griesbach; so also Sinaiticus.—E. H.]

[5] Ver. 12.—ἐν πνεύματι in the *Recepta*. Omitted by Lachmann and Tischendorf. [Neither are they in the Sinaiticus.—E. H.]

[6] Ver. 15.—[Vulg. is striking here, "*in his esto.*"—E. H.]

[7] Ver. 15.—Ἐν to be left out. See Tischendorf on the place.

[8] Ver. 16.—[σου. Not in the Sinaiticus.—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 6. **If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things.** *These things*, ταῦτα, that is, the same which he has spoken of in vers. 3-5, in refutation of the heretics, whose errors, at least in germ, had already sprung up here and there in the neighborhood of Timothy. It is, however, possible that the word looks back to the whole pericope (chap. iii. 14; iv. 5); for the error here is the entire opposite of the main truths of the gospel which Paul had stated in the preceding verses.—*Putting in remembrance*, ὑποτιϑέμενος. Literally, to put under foot; henee, to suggest, to recommend, or (Luther) to hold before. If Timothy does this, he will be a good minister of Jesus Christ; he will fulfil rightly the διακονία (2 Tim. iv. 5) entrusted to him. The more exact description follows of the character of a deacon, which Timothy would thus manifest; **nourished in the words of faith and of good doctrine, whereunto thou hast attained.** The λόγοι τῆς πίστεως are here represented as the constant means of growth and nurture for the inward life of Timothy (comp. 1 Pet. ii. 2); and

the present, as Bengel here rightly remarked, is used "*cum respectu præteriti.*" The Christian education of Timothy is not here represented as incomplete (De Wette), but as still capable of development. The Christian, or the Christian teacher, may be complete so far as his present point of view extends; yet he may be called to strive after a higher one (comp. 2 Tim. ii. 15).—**Good doctrine,** ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία (chap. i. 10), in contrast to the μῦθοι, γενεαλογίαι, &c., of the heretics.

Ver. 7. **Refuse profane and old wives' fables.** Timothy is thus alike bound to a conflict with the heretics, and to the maintenance of the truth. Paul calls the opinions of these heretics μύθους, mere abstract speculations, without any connection with the historical realities and practical tendencies of Christianity, for the origin of which see ver. 1. Timothy must reject all these, and not only in his public capacity as a teacher, but, as is clear from what follows, in his personal conduct. The exact description of these fables is noticeable; Paul calls them βεβήλους (unspiritual; Luther), *profanos*, the opposite of ὁσίους (comp. 2 Tim. ii. 16) and γραώδεις (ἅπαξ λεγόμ.), from γραῦς, *vetula s. anus;* the custom of old women; silly, foolish (comp. 2 Tim. ii. 23). The first epithet denotes the character of the μῦθοι as to their matter, the latter as to their formal statement.—**Exercise thyself rather unto godliness,** πρὸς εὐσέβειαν; that is, that thou mayest become truly godly. Without doubt Timothy had been such already from his youth (2 Tim. i. 5); but the development of the Christian life is, according to the words and example of Paul, unending (Phil. iii. 12–14). As regards the subject itself, we have here a similar exhortation to that literally expressed in the last chapter of this Epistle (1 Tim. vi. 11), and figuratively in ver. 12. As to its form, it should, however, be observed, that the figure, γυμνάζειν, forcibly denoted the effort which is necessary to the exercise of godliness. The Apostle was perhaps led by the preceding ἐντρέφεσθαι to the use of imagery drawn from the gymnasium: "*Paulus coram solitus erat Timotheum exercere, nunc jubet, ut Timotheus sibi ipse Paulus sit;*" Bengel.

Ver. 8. **For bodily exercise,** σωματικὴ γυμνασία. According to many, the physical abstinence from certain food, from marriage, &c.—a discipline which the heretics (see vers. 1–3) commended, but Paul condemned. According to others, he means the gymnastic exercises so much in vogue with the Greeks, especially the Olympic games. The latter view seems preferable, since the Apostle surely would not attach the slightest use to the first named, which he had declared a doctrine of the devil; he had, besides, said nothing further of it in the verses just before, and probably used this substantive simply on account of the preceding γυμνάζειν. It is possible, indeed (Bengel), that Timothy had practised some bodily asceticism (1 Tim. v. 23), which Paul did not condemn in itself, but regarded as merely outward, far below the εὐσέβεια. The first had indeed its use, yet only πρὸς ὀλίγον; *i. e.*, not, for a short time, as James iv. 14, but, as follows from the antithesis to πρὸς πάντα, *in a slight degree.* It might serve for the increase of bodily strength, for rescue from danger, for gaining a crown of honor; yet these were in any case temporal. It is otherwise with the εὐσέβεια; it is profitable for all things, in the full force of the word; even for that ὀλίγον toward which the σωματικὴ γυμνασία serves, but beyond this, for an infinitely higher end. It has the promise of life, both present and future; that is, God has given promises to a godly life, which concern as well this world as that which is to come. SALVIANUS, *De gubernatione Dei:* "*Religiosi et sancti viri et præsentis fidei oblectamenta capiunt et beatitudinis futuræ præmia consequuntur.*" Calvin: "*Qui pietatem habet, illi nihil deest, etiamsi careat istis adminiculis. Nam pietas se sola contenta est ad solidam perfectionem.*"—[Perhaps a prominent idea of St. Paul, in drawing his imagery from the Greek *gymnastic*, is the contrast of a manly, Christian athlete to the false ascetic. The true exercise begins with the inner man, with the εὐσέβεια, not with the σῶμα.—W.]—**Promise of the life.** *Genitiv. objecti*, so that the present and the future life are contained in the promise. The life on earth (comp. Eph. vi. 2) and the life hereafter is promised to the godly, as the natural result of grace.

Ver. 9. **Faithful is the saying.** See chap. i. 15; where, however, this expression refers to what immediately follows, as here to what immediately precedes. Paul here removes possible objections, which perhaps might arise with Timothy against this statement (ver. 8).

Ver. 10. **For therefore we both labor,** &c. Εἰς τοῦτο, *sc.*, *ad hoc consequendum.* This promise, especially that of eternal life, rises before the soul of the Apostle as the end for which he gladly undergoes the severest toil and suffering (comp. Col. i. 29). Instead of the ὀνειδιζόμεθα of the *Recepta*, A. C. F. G. and others have ἀγωνιζόμεθα, which is accepted by Lachmann, but rejected by Tischendorf as not fully authenticated. Κοπιάω, a fit phrase for the toilsome labor of the Apostle, as well in action as in suffering.—**Because we trust in the living God.** This clause is not to be referred to both the preceding verbs, but only to the last ὀνειδ. There rises now to the view of the Apostle, with the image of his work, the image of the trials inseparably connected with it. Perhaps while writing this letter, he had in his own experience a special motive, unknown to us, which leads him so expressly to speak of this trust. He will not say that his enemies designedly reviled him because he trusted in the *living* God; but he only names the real ground of all their hostility. Yet at the same time this is his comfort, for he has trusted in the living God; no dead abstraction, as so many spun from the brains of these Ephesian heretics, but a God who Himself lives, and will bestow the hoped-for life on us (ver. 8).—**Who is the Saviour of all men.** Not a relative clause without any connection (De Wette), but of this logical force, that God could not fulfil the hope resting upon Him if He were not likewise σωτήρ in the full sense of the word. And, again, in so unconstrained a letter as this, it was a necessity for the heart of the Apostle to give this chief place to the sound and precious doctrine to which he had already alluded (chap. ii. 4). In respect to God as the σωτήρ, see chap. i. 1. The abuse of this universal proposition is easily met, if we only draw the just distinction between those who are the object of the yearning love of God, and those who through faith already enjoy its fruits. The example of a true gospel tenderness, without a surrender of its right principle, is given by Calvin on this passage: "*Intelligit, Dei beneficentiam ad omnes homines pervenire. Quod si nemo est mortalium, qui non sentiat Dei erga se bonitatem ejusque sit particeps, quanto magis eam experientur pii, qui in eum sperant?*

An non peculiarem ipsorum gerat curam, an non multo liberalius se in eos effundet? An non denique omni ex parte salvos ad finem præstabit?"

Ver. 11. **These things command and teach.** Ταῦτα. "*Hæc, missis cæteris;*" Bengel. The Apostle here refers directly to all that he has said in vers. 8–10, not exclusively to the representation of God as σωτήρ. Between command and teach (*gebieten und lehren*, German), this distinction may perhaps be drawn, that the one regards rather the practical, the other the theoretical side of the subjects of which Timothy is to remind his hearers.

Ver. 12. **Let no man despise thy youth** (comp. Titus ii. 15). Not an express exhortation to the church (Huther), that it show due respect to Timothy as its teacher, in spite of his youth; for the following ἀλλὰ τύπος γίνου shows clearly that the exhortation is designed directly and only for Timothy himself. He must not allow any one to despise his youth (σου depends on νεότητος, and not on καταφρονείτω, which would give a hard and forced construction), but must also so conduct himself that no one can rightly despise it. In so far Bengel says rightly: "*Talem te gere, quem nemo possit tanquam juvenem contemnere.*" It is the negative side of the rules of conduct which are positively given in the following verses. As to the youth of Timothy, we must infer, from Acts xvi. 1–3, that he was quite young when he first met Paul; and after this period, ten or twelve years at least must have elapsed, so that Timothy now was perhaps a man of thirty-two or thirty-four years. Thus, in comparison with the presbyters, widows, deaconesses, &c., with whom he must so largely associate, he might be called young. Perhaps we may infer from chap. v. 23, and 1 Cor. xvi. 11, that Timothy was not very imposing in his external appearance.—**But be thou an example of the believers . . . in purity.** A like exhortation is addressed to Titus, chap. ii. 7. The Apostle names five things (not six; see the Critical notes) in which Timothy should give an example. First, **in word,** ἐν λόγῳ, not exclusively in public teaching, but as well in daily conversation; **in behavior,** ἐν ἀναστροφῇ, which must be in full harmony with his words; **in love, in faith**—the two chief elements of the inner Christian life of which language and behavior are the outward signs; **in purity,** last of all; ἐν ἁγνείᾳ, including the chastity becoming the youthful Timothy; but this is not here exclusively denoted. This, like other kindred words, is often used of the moral purity which embraces as a fruit of faith and love the whole outer and inner life. In view of the ascetic rigor of the heretics, Timothy should avoid all that might give even apparent reason for the suspicion that he preached a lax morality.

Ver. 13. **Till I come, give attendance to reading,** &c. (comp. chap. i. 3; iii. 14). During the absence of the Apostle, no changes should take place in the wonted order of things. All must remain continuous with the old. Πρόσεχε; *Da operam et curam.*—*Give attendance to—Reading,* ἀναγνώσει. The public reading of the holy Scriptures, which with the Jews was taken out of the Law and the Prophets (Luke iv. 16; Acts xiii. 15); but in following this custom, the Christians read at first from the Old, and afterwards from the New Testament writings (comp. Col. iv. 16; Rev. i. 3). A description of this custom in the early Christian church is found in JUSTIN., *Apol.* 1, p. 67, edit. Oberth.—**To exhortation, to doctrine.** Here, as in Rom. xii. 7, 8, placed together. The former was necessary for special cases, the latter daily for all.

Ver. 14. **Neglect not,** &c. The same precept in another form, as in 2 Tim. i. 6. At his entrance on the office of teacher, Timothy received by the Holy Ghost a special gift, of high value in the exercise of his office. The office itself is not here denoted, but his Divine qualification for the office, which was given through (διά) prophecy, with the laying on of hands of the elders. The brevity of this allusion gives large room for conjecture. It is possible that at this solemnity there were Christian prophets, who foretold a specially noble career for Timothy; that these prophets belonged to the fellowship of the elders (πρεσβυτερίου), here regarded as a college; and that Paul himself, or one of his companions in travel, had uttered this prediction. But whatever the fact, this prediction was joined with the laying on of hands, first by Paul himself (2 Tim. i. 5), and again by the other presbyters.—**Laying on of hands.** This was of old a symbol of the communication of the Holy Ghost (Acts viii. 17; xix. 6; Heb. vi. 2). Already in the Old Testament it was usual at the ordination of a priest (Ex. xxix. 10; Num. viii. 10), or even in case of promotion to a high dignity (Num. xxvii. 18; Deut. xxxiv. 9), and later, in the days of the New Covenant, in the healing of the sick (Matt. ix. 18) and the raising of the dead (Mark v. 23). This laying on of hands was without doubt connected with solemn prayer; and it still continued in the Christian Church in the case of ordination to the office of teacher and presbyter. Apart from the supernatural influence which may have been joined with this act in the apostolic age, it is clear that the personal effect must have been very deep and beneficial. To keep alive this impression, Timothy must constantly renew its remembrance, and not allow the gifts entrusted to him to slumber. But in what particular church this act had taken place, remains uncertain. The church tradition names Ephesus as then the sphere of Timothy's labors; and to this there can be no material objection. [This passage has been often cited as a proof of the power of presbyterial ordination. It doubtless refers to the setting apart of Timothy for the ministry; yet it may be not to his higher office as St. Paul's successor, but as a presbyter at Lystra. See ELLICOTT, *in loco*. In that case, it proves only that the presbytery shared in the laying on of hands—a custom which from the first, till now, has continued in cases of persbyterial ordination. See BINGHAM, *Antiq.*, B. 2, ch. 19. It must be fully admitted, however, that the later hierarchical changes greatly lowered the rank of the presbyter-bishop of the primitive day.—W.]

Ver. 15. **Meditate upon these things.** A general concluding exhortation. Ταῦτα specially reverts to vers. 12–16. It must be Timothy's careful endeavor to learn by heart the Apostle's precepts.—**Give thyself to them.** Ἐν τούτοις ἴσθι, *totus in his esto;* heart and head, soul and body. It is not enough for Paul that Timothy should follow his calling with the fidelity of a slave; he must live wholly in and for it. Compare the Horatian maxim: *Quid verum atque decens, curo et rogo, et omnis in hoc sum.*—**That thy profiting may appear to all.** Progress, προκοπή; a word which only occurs here and in Phil. i. 12, 25, and is in each case genuinely Pauline. This προκοπή would be more and more manifest to all Christians (πᾶσιν), if he truly and heartily obeyed the precepts given in vers. 12–14

Timothy must not be content with the height he had now attained, but always strive after a higher and higher development.

Ver. 16. **Take heed unto thyself.** A comprehensive exhortation at the close of this whole chapter, in which Timothy is charged with a twofold duty, each in its order, of watching as well over himself as over the doctrine. Calvin: "*Duo sunt curanda bono pastori: ut docendo invigilet, ac se ipsum purum custodiat. Neque enim satis est, si vitam suam componat ad omnem honestatem, sibique caveat, ne quod edat malum exemplum, nisi assiduum quoque docendi studium adjungat sanctæ vitæ. Et parum valebit doctrina, si non respondeat vitæ honestas et sanctitas. Non ergo abs re Paulus Timotheum incitat, ut tam privatim sibi attendat, quam doctrinæ in communem Ecclesiæ usum.*"—**Continue in them.** Ἐπίμενε αὐτοῖς, *i. e.*, in all the duties mentioned. The connection with the following, so as to understand the *audientes* by αὐτοῖς, is less natural.—**For in doing this.** The sense of the σωτηρία is positive as well as negative. As to the former, Paul probably meant the saving of Timothy himself, and of those that heard him, from false doctrine and its unhappy effects. But with this is joined the gaining of the salvation promised through the gospel to all that believe, the blessedness of which Timothy and his hearers would thus more and more partake. A twofold and most alluring reward is thus assured to his fidelity.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Personal growth in godliness is the chief requisite of the pastor and teacher, not only for his own sake, but for his flock and for the preaching of the gospel. His discourse would be sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal, were it not the revelation and the outpouring of the inward spiritual life, which he must cherish with the utmost care. As there is a sickly asceticism, so there is also a sound discipline, which is needed specially for the practical theologian and pastor. The saying of an old Strasburg divine is brief, but full of deep truth: "I would rather make one soul blessed, than a hundred learned" (Lütkemann).

2. That godliness is profitable for all things, and thus the most practical thing in the world, cannot be too strongly enforced against an abstract idealism on one side, and an irreligious materialism on the other. How many there are who know indeed that godliness is good for a peaceful death, but do not hold it necessary for a happy life; how many others who think faith very beautiful for the poor, the weak, the suffering, the dying, but not to make real, able, practical men. It must always, therefore, be remembered that the gospel is a power which grasps the whole man; and the true Christian is not only the happiest person, but the bravest citizen, the best patriot, the most obedient soldier, the greatest chief; in one word, in all relations, a co-worker with God, and an honor to Christ. An excellent example of this is found in the English General Havelock.

3. That this life, as well as the future, may have a great reward, does not at all conflict with the doctrine of God's free grace, and the justification of the sinner by it (see "Heidelberg Catechism," Answer 63, and the essay of Weiss, The Christian Doctrine of Reward, *Stud. und Krit.*, 1852).

4. The χαρίσματα of the apostolic age were partly extraordinary, fitted to that early period; partly ordinary, and designed to remain for all ages. To the former belonged the gift of prophecy, which was exercised at the ordination of Timothy, and on other occasions (see, for instance, Acts xxi. 9); and which, to all who had it, was a μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (Rev. xix. 10)—a witness given by the Lord Himself that they were not only His real, but His best and most approved disciples. If the χάρισμα in this form has now ceased, yet the apostolic counsel of 1 Cor. xiv. 1 is as true for all believers; and the New Covenant has no other aim than to realize more and more the ideal of Moses; Num. xi. 29.

5. No office requires so much the whole man, the surrender of all our personal powers, as that of the ministry; the active hand is always with the single and steadfast heart. The man who exercises his office without living entirely for it, is no shepherd, but a hireling. Bengel thus illustrates ver. 15: "*In his qui est, minus erit in sodalitatibus mundanis, in studiis alienis, in colligendis libris, conchis, nummis, in quibus multi pastores notabilem ætatis partem inscienter conterunt.*" Weighty examples of the blessing joined with this conscientious fidelity, may be found, among others, in Tholuck's excellent book, "Living Witnesses from all ranks in the Lutheran Church;" Berlin, 1839. The name of Chalmers, McCheyne, and other ornaments of British Christianity, may here be cited with high honor. And who will soon forget the noble Adolph Monod? *Ave pia anima!*

6. On ver. 13: "*Monet etiam Paulus hic, Ecclesiam alligatam esse ad certos libros, sicut sæpe alias præcipitur* (*Isa.* viii. 20). *Necesse est igitur, rejici doctrinas et illuminationes pugnantes cum his libris. Item opiniones et cultus extra hos libros;*" Melanchthon.

7. "Take heed to thyself, and to the doctrine." Comp. Acts xx. 28. An excellent essay on this subject is found in the little golden book of Richard Baxter, "The Reformed Pastor," translated from the English, Berlin, 1833; which expressly shows that there should be as little defect in the one as in the other, and what belongs to each. "The pastor who takes heed to himself, must take heed that the work of grace be truly accomplished in him; that he grow more and more in it; that his conduct do not stand opposed to his doctrine; that he do not live in any sin which he condemns in another; that none of the qualities requisite for his office be lacking in him. Whoso has to care for his flock, must give heed that no other than pure doctrine is preached; and he will watch, likewise, that greater stress be not laid on *true* faith than on true *faith*."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

There is no higher title of honor, than justly to be called a good minister of Jesus Christ.—The word of faith the best food by which the pastor is sustained.—How much must the true minister of the gospel daily learn and teach.—The Christian discipline.—Bodily exercise not to be wholly despised, but far less to be overvalued.—Exercise in godliness must be practised: (1.) By every Christian; (2.) every pastor; (3.) especially every young pastor.—Godliness a business, which (1.) requires; (2.) deserves; (3.) rewards daily exercise.—Not only eternal, but temporal life and success, the blessing of a true devotion.—No preaching of the gospel without

work; no work without offence; no work and offence without reward.—To the true preacher all things must preach.—The youthful overseer of the flock must see that he be in advance of his years.—The Lord also says, as does His apostles: "Until I come, give heed to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine."—Spiritual gifts must be most heedfully cherished.—Whoso hath, to him shall be given; Matt. xiii. 12.—The great expectations which the teacher of a flock has early called forth, impose on him a double duty.—To stand still in the spiritual life, is to go back. "*Studiis profici, moribus vero defici, non est profici, sed defici.*"—The twofold calling of the minister of the gospel: (1.) Take heed to thyself; (2.) take heed to the doctrine; (3.) take heed to thyself no less than the doctrine, and to the doctrine not without constant heed to thyself.—We must look to it, that, while we preach to others, we ourselves be not castaways (1 Cor. ix. 27).—"The wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they who turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever" (Dan. xii. 3).—The minister of Christ may save others, yet himself be lost.—STARKE: Froward minds, that always love to dispute and quarrel, and think little of love and godliness, God mend them! —Bodily exercise is only an attendant on spiritual exercise.—Watching, fasting, toiling, self-restraint, help thee in this, that thy flesh rule not over the spirit, and so hinder godliness (1 Cor. vii. 5).—ARTON: Godliness is not dead. Hast thou godliness? It matters little whether thou hast bodily exercise. But if thou hast not godliness, thy bodily exercise is only hypocrisy.—Disciplined feelings are found in ripe Christians, old in gifts, wisdom, and strength, not in years (Prov. iv. 9).—Samuel, the youthful, was a faithful prophet before Eli the aged (1 Sam. iii. 10). But so also was Samuel, the aged, before his youthful sons (1 Sam. viii. 3).—LANGE'S *Opus*: Nothing brings a young man, especially in his official intercourse with others, more respect, than wise, prudent, exemplary action.—God's grace and our toil must ever go together. For without grace, no toil avails; and without toil, no grace is rightly used and kept unimpaired, far less increased (1 Cor. xv. 10).—CRAMER: We should stir up the gift of God which He has enkindled in us, as a man stirs up a fire in the ashes, piles on wood, and increases the flame (2 Tim. i. 6).—The church authorities should care for the preacher, that he be not drawn away from his study (Ecclus. xxxviii. 25).—One cannot exist without the other; he who has no care for his own salvation, will have far less for the salvation of his flock (chap. iii. 5).

HEUBNER: Much bodily exercise may cause spiritual harm, may excite a coarse, brutal spirit, the opposite of self-restraint and self-denial.—Religion awakens all our spiritual powers; the same man, formed by religion, will do infinitely more than without religion.—Man can never profit himself save by godliness.—He who searches Scripture aright, can exhort and teach.—It is a fearful sorrow to have had good gifts, and not to have used them.—The pastor who does not grow perceptibly, must, more than all men, become immoral.—Care for our own souls, and the souls of others, is very closely connected.

LISCO: How is a good minister of Jesus Christ formed? (1.) By his inner life; (2.) by his outward activity.—Godliness is profitable for all things.

VON GERLACH: The capacity for the office of a true pastor, as it proceeds out of a life with God in his heart, must ever draw him back to his own life; his whole attention must be always equally given to himself and to the doctrine, to his own and his hearers' salvation.—How can a man think to form the kingdom of God in another, if he has not given heed to form it in himself? And, again, how great is the reward of those who, without losing sight of themselves, sacrifice self for the salvation of others.

BAXTER: It is the great, widespread evil of the Church, that it has unrenewed and inexperienced pastors; that so many become preachers before they become Christians, and are consecrated as priests at the altar of God before they are made holy to Christ by the offering of the heart to Him; and thus they worship an unknown God, and proclaim an unknown Christ, and pray through an unknown Spirit, and preach of a state of holiness, and fellowship with Christ, and a glory and a blessedness, which are wholly unknown to them, and perhaps will remain unknown through all eternity! He must be indeed a heartless preacher, who has not himself in his own heart the Christ and the grace which he declares. Alas, that all scholars in our universities might well ponder this!

SAURIN, "A Sermon on the Profit of Godliness" (ver. 8), in his Sermons, vi. p. 377: The influence of the fear of God on our health; our good name; our wealth; on the rest of the heart; the peace of conscience; and what concerns the future life: all this becomes manifest in its power, when we consider the devout man in his daily conduct, in his retirement, at the Supper of the Lord, at the approach of death.—Very rich in thought and clear in argument.

XI.

Directions in reference to the Management of the Community.

A.—How Timothy must conduct himself toward aged and young persons of both sexes in the community, and especially toward the widows.

CH. V. 1-16.

1 Rebuke not an elder [an aged man], but entreat *him* as a father; [,] *and*
2 the younger men as brethren; [,] The elder women as mothers; [,] the younger
3 as sisters, with [in] all purity.[1] Honor widows that are widows indeed.
4 But if any widow have children or nephews, let them learn first to shew piety

at home, and to requite their parents: for that[2] is good and acceptable before
5 God. Now she that is a widow indeed, and desolate, trusteth in God,[3] and
6 continueth in supplications and prayers night and day. But she that liveth in
7 pleasure, is dead while she liveth.[4] And these things give in charge, that they
8 may be blameless. But if any provide[5] not for his own, and specially for those
9 of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel. Let
not a widow be taken into the number under threescore years old, having been
10 the wife of one man, Well reported of for good works; [,] if she have brought
up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints' feet
[feet of saints], if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed
11 every good work. But the younger widows refuse: for when they have begun
12 to wax wanton[6] against Christ, they will marry; [,] Having damnation, because
they have cast off their first faith [have laid aside = turned away from their
13 first fidelity]. And withal they learn *to be* idle, wandering about from house to
house; [,] and not only idle, but tattlers also and busybodies, speaking things
14 which they ought not. I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear
children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproach-
15, 16 fully. For some are already turned aside after Satan.[7] If any man or
woman that believeth[8] have widows, let them relieve them, and let not the
church be charged; [,] that it may relieve them that are widows indeed.

[1] Ver. 2.—[In contrast with the common form, the Sinaiticus has αγνιᾳ.—E. H.]
[2] Ver. 4.—Received text: "That is *good and* acceptable." The words καλὸν καὶ are, after A. C. D. F. G., Sinaiticus, and other witnesses, to be stricken out.
[3] Ver. 5.—[Lachmann brackets the article τὸν, before Θεὸν; and the Sinaiticus, instead of Θεὸν, has κύριον, without the article.—E. H.]
[4] Ver. 6.—[Vulg., *vivens mortua est.*—E. H.]
[5] Ver. 8.—[προνοεῖ; Sinaiticus, προνοεῖται.—E. H.]
[6] Ver. 11.—[καταστρηνιάσωσιν; Lachmann has, in the margin, καταστρηνιάσουσιν.—E. H.]
[7] Ver. 15.—[Instead of the common order, ἐξετράπησαν τινες, the Sinaiticus has τινες ἐξετράπ.; also Lachmann, in margin.—E. H.]
[8] Ver. 16.—[The received text, and, among the recent editors, Tischendorf, have εἴ τις πιστὸς ἢ πιστή. The Vulg. reads: *si quis fidelis.* Lachmann omits τις πιστὸς ἢ. Nor are these words in the Sinaiticus.—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **An elder.** After the Apostle, at the close of the previous chapter, has given Timothy his general exhortation and counsel as to the conduct of his high office, he passes to a more exact view of his duty in the guidance of the church, with special reference to persons of differing positions, age, and sex. Melanchthon: "*Addit admonitiones particulares aliquot de negotiis forensibus et œconomicis, et insigne testimonium est, quod Deo placeant officia debita cognatis.*"—*An elder*, πρεσβυτέρῳ; not an elder in the official sense, as is plain from the contrast with the νεωτέροι, but a member of the church, *provectioris ætatis.*—**Rebuke not**; that is, in case he has been guilty of some offence, reprove him not with violence and severity, *noli eum increpare.* Youthful zeal and impulse might easily mislead Timothy in this, since many sins are really more offensive when committed by the aged.—**But entreat him as a father.** Act toward him as a right-minded son would to a father whom he perceives to have fallen into wrong.—**The younger men as brethren,** *sc.*, παρακάλει, without any self-exaltation over them. Timothy must thus exhort all, without distinction; but the tone and manner and spirit of his words must be modified according to the differing circumstances of those whom he addressed.

Ver. 2. **The elder women . . . purity.** He must keep toward the elder women the same conduct as toward the elder men. In respect to the younger women of the church, he is reminded most emphatically of the duty of ἁγνείᾳ. Grammatically, this requirement may be referred to all the preceding clauses, but logically it belongs only to νεωτέρας. Although the ἁγνείᾳ here urged consists first in chastity, its whole force is not thus exhausted (comp. chap. iv. 12). The conduct of Timothy must be morally pure in its fullest sense, so as to guard himself not only from evil, but from the appearance of evil.—**As sisters.** Bengel well says: "*Hic respectus egregie adjuvat castitatem.*"

Ver. 3. **Honor widows.** Χήρας is entirely general, although afterward different classes among widows are spoken of.—*Hold in honor*, τίμα; not merely by care and support from the treasury of the church (De Wette), but again quite general: show them the honor and respect that belong to a widow, as well as help in their necessities.—**That are widows indeed,** τὰς ὄντως χήρας; a more exact description of those widows whom Paul specially commends to Timothy. The following more fully explains his meaning. Those who still have children, or other near kindred, who can and ought to maintain them, are not χῆραι in the free sense of the word. That the Apostle chiefly speaks of the outward condition, not of the personal character of widows (Schleiermacher), clearly follows from ver. 4 (comp. also ver. 16). In ver. 5 the Apostle first alludes to the spirit and demeanor of the widow who really deserves the name. In all that concerns the local and temporal view of this subject, the following verse is of special importance; for it is the fullest passage in the whole New Testament, treating of the character, the rights, and the duties of a Christian widow. In vers. 4–8 the Apostle names the widows who can justly claim support from the

church; then, in vers. 9-16, the widows who should be or should not be chosen for the service of the church.

Ver. 4. **But if any widow have children or nephews.** According to Acts vi. 1, widows were almost the first objects of Christian beneficence; and from various evidences in Justin, Ignatius, Eusebius, and others, it appears that they were very early regarded with special affection. This beneficence seems, however, to have been soon abused by the indolence of some who had widows among their near relatives, but sought to escape their own duty by giving them to the charge of the church. The church was thus burdened beyond its powers, and Christian love exercised at the cost of natural relationship. Against this wrong condition the precept of the Apostle was directed, and the community was freed from the obligation of sustaining those who had near relatives.—The children or nephews [*grandchildren*] must learn (*μανθανέτωσαν*)—not the widows themselves (Matthies)—**to shew piety at home.** By home is here designated the whole family, inclusive of the widowed mother or grandmother; and the *εὐσεβεῖν* which Paul sets forth for them, does not mean godly rule (Luther), but the exhibition of a childlike, pious spirit, as becomes the children and grandchildren of such widows. Thus they should **requite their parents,** especially the widowed, *ἀμοιβὰς ἀποδιδόναι*; that is, show thankfulness, by caring for their physical support.—**Acceptable before God;** who has promised a special blessing on the true fulfilment of filial duty (Eph. vi. 12; comp. Mark vii. 10, 11). The connection of this precept is thus quite necessary; and it is a riddle to us how Huther, in his commentary on this passage, otherwise so able, explains these last words not of the duties of the children, but of the widows themselves; *i. e.*, that the widows were to take care of the children and grandchildren, and thereby requite the love which had been shown them by the deceased parents. Even if, as we doubt, no verbal difficulties prevented this exposition—which is defended by Matthies likewise, and many older commentators—it would still be quite unnatural and forced; while, on the other hand, the connection favors our view; and this, too, is in the main also the view of De Wette. Theodoret had already given the correct sense, when he wrote: *μανθανέτωσαν τὰ ἔκγονα τιμᾶν τὴν οἰκείαν μητέρα ἢ μάμμην.* That by *οἶκος* is denoted all the persons belonging to a house, including even the servants, is clear, among several passages, from John iv. 53; Acts xvi. 31.

Ver. 5. **Now she that is a widow indeed,** &c. "*Viduæ, liberos habenti, opponitur ver. 5, vidua, cui non sunt, a quibus mutuam vicem accipit, quæ spes unice in Deo collocatas habet;*" Bengel.—*A widow indeed, ὄντως χήρα* (comp. ver. 3). The word *χήρα* expresses loneliness; and this idea is now strengthened by the addition to it, **and desolate,** *καὶ μεμονωμένη*; *i. e.*, utterly without children or grandchildren who could care for her. It follows of necessity that the church must support such widows; and it is called to their remembrance in ver. 16. But here the Apostle gives a description of the personal disposition of a widow, which contains a like exhortation and comfort. He sketches the character of those whom Timothy should honor (ver. 3), that he may counsel him as to his own duty as teacher, and as to the requirements which he is carefully to urge on such poor women. "The idea of the true widow is not expressed abstractly, but in concrete, by supposing a real person; and hence instead of the imperative or the optative, the indicative is used (*ἤλπικεν* and *προσμένει*), as if some individual widow were described as the representative of all;" Matthies. Of the two traits here mentioned, **trusteth in God** is indirectly contrasted with trust in children or grandchildren; while the following, **and continueth in supplications and prayers night and day,** is the precise opposite of that disposition which, just afterward, is condemned (ver. 6) in a word. (On *δέησις* and *προσευχή*, see note on chap. ii. 1.) We can scarcely escape the thought that the Apostle, in sketching this character, had before his mind a real person, perhaps the prophetess Anna (Luke ii. 36-38), who, although at the close of the Old Covenant, may be called in many respects the type of the Christian widow.

Ver. 6. **But she that liveth in pleasure, is dead.** A true Pauline thought (comp. Rom. viii. 13), and a fine contrast to the picture of the "widow indeed," who, while dead to the world and its pleasures, in a higher sense was living. *Σπαταλῶσα* (comp. James v. 5), according to Hesychius; *ἀναλίσκειν ἀσώτως καὶ ἀσώτως ἀλαζονεύεσθαι.*—**Is dead while she liveth** (comp. Matt. viii. 22); spoken of a widow with double fitness, "*quippe quæ nec naturaliter jam, nec spiritualiter frugi sit;*" Bengel. That it is to be understood in this sense, that she has no further support to expect from the church-treasury, is neither directly nor indirectly involved in the words of the Apostle. The entire dissolution of the moral life is here represented as a warning, while it is left to the wisdom of Timothy to make the best provision for such cases. As to the expression itself, comp. Rev. iii. 1, and the beautiful words of SENECA, *Epist.* 71: "*Vita mors est et quidem turpis, inter fœda versantibus.*"

Ver. 7. **And these things . . . be blameless.** *Ταῦτα* may be in various ways connected with the preceding, either only with ver. 6, or with ver. 3 *et sqq.*, or even with vers. 5 and 6. The latter seems certainly to deserve the preference; and thus the following words, **that they may be blameless,** definitely refer to the widows. For children, or other relations who forget their duties to the widows, the Apostle has a much more severe rebuke (ver. 8). Beyond his careful attention to the physical comfort of widows, he wishes them to strive, as befits Christians, after moral blamelessness, and reflect on his words of encouragement and warning as they concern their personal character. Apart from the question of their claim to support, it is only thus they can be blameless according to the will of the Lord, and ornaments of His Church on earth.

Ver. 8. **But if any provide not for his own.** The Epistle turns now from the widows, to those on whom first (*πρῶτον*, ver. 4) rests the duty of their support, and who, if they perversely refuse this sacred debt, deserve a sharp censure. It is, indeed, quite indefinite; *εἰ δέ τις, κ.τ.λ.*, and therefore it may rightly be taken as a general exhortation, implying the duty of each to care for his own kindred. In this connection, however, it does not apparently refer to the duty of widows to their children (Heinrichs, Planck), but to any relatives who are under high and sacred obligations to support widows (comp. ver. 16). The Apostle would prick the conscience of those who seek a pretext to escape this duty.—**Those of his own house,** are not associates in the faith (Gal. vi. 10), but those of his

family in the natural sense of the word.—*Provide not* (comp. ver. 4).—**He hath denied the faith,** τὴν πίστιν ἤρνηται; the Christian faith, which is active in love and inseparable from love, and releases no man from the fulfilment of natural duties, but imposes them on all.—**Is worse than an infidel.** Many of the heathen recognized and performed the duty of caring for their needy parents; and thus the Christian who refuses it is below the very idolater. Calvin: "*Quod duabus de causis verum est, nam quo plus quisque in cognitione Dei profec t, eo minus habet excusationes. Ergo in fidelibus sunt pejores, qui in clara Dei luce cæcutiunt. Deinde hoc genus officii est, quod natura ipsa dictat, sunt enim στοργαὶ φυσικαί. Quod si natura duce infideles ultro propensi sunt ad suos amandos, quid de iis sentiendum, qui nullo tali affectu tanguntur? Nonne impios ipsos ferocitate superant?*"

Ver. 9. **Let not a widow be taken,** Χήρα καταλεγέσθω. The Apostle passes now to the second point, of which he would remind them in respect to widows; and the only question is, what is meant by καταλέγειν. The word itself presents no difficulty; it is to choose, to note or register in a list (*in catalogum referre*), as, *e. g.*, citizens, soldiers, taxpayers, are classed together, and thus publicly distinguished from others. As to its real meaning here, we must decide whether it denotes a place on the list of those publicly supported, or an enrolment in the order of church deaconesses. Almost all the older commentators are of the first opinion; nearly all the recent ones of the latter. (On the literature of the subject, compare De Wette *in loco.*) We think, too, that there are almost insurmountable difficulties in the way of the first view. For if only the maintenance of widows is here spoken of, why, then, the rule that no widow under sixty years of age should be admitted, while yet younger widows without near relatives had an undoubted right to such support? Why the requirement that they must have the evidence of good works, that they must have brought up children, lodged strangers, washed the saints' feet, relieved the afflicted, followed diligently every good work? Should those, who perhaps had not once had an opportunity for the exercise of such good deeds, remain excluded from the charity of the church? Why, further, must a widow, in order to be put on a list of the poor, have had but one husband? CHRYSOSTOM, therefore, Homil. 31, *De diversis N. T. locis*, has justly expressed himself against this view; and it is indeed only apparently favored by ver. 16. See further below. All the evidence shows that the Apostle designs here a selection for a distinct service in the church—a service in the nature of things confined to women, and therefore the office of deaconess (comp. chap. iii. 11), of which we have a pattern in Phœbe (Rom. xvi. 1, 2); and it seems that only those invested with such an office were to be maintained by the church. This last circumstance explains probably why the Apostle speaks fully in this place of the female ministers of the church, and not before in chap. iii., where otherwise it would have agreed better with the whole connection.—As love to the Lord had before impelled some women to serve Him and His (Luke viii. 2, 3), so in the apostolic age it had probably led believing sisters to undertake the office of deaconess. The fact that adult women were baptized made this arrangement necessary; and again, the maintenance of the invalid poor, the training up of orphan children, and other works of love, were best entrusted to such hands. When the church had become accustomed to such a service, it could not well dispense with it; and in the place of those retiring or dying, new fellow-workers—the first Sisters of Charity, so to speak—would be chosen and set apart. For this, definite instructions were necessary, which the Apostle in this passage gives to Timothy. It is to some degree apparent, from the requirements here made, in what their office consisted—duties of hospitality, of training children, &c. It cannot be proved that only widows were inducted into this office of deaconess. As to Phœbe (Rom. xvi. 1), it is not known whether she was virgin, wife, or widow; and from chap. iii. 11 it seems to follow that the wives of deacons performed like services of love. Yet it lay in the nature of the case that widows of a certain age must be specially allotted to such a service, both because they were free from other duties, which else might have had a prior claim (see ver. 8), and because their love to the Lord and to the church could not repay more fitly the charity bestowed on them. It is of such a church-widowhood, a τάγμα χηρῶν, TERTULLIAN (*De virgin. veland.*, *cap.* 9) says: "*Ad quam sedem* (*viduarum*) *præter annos LX. non tantum univiræ*, i. e., *nuptæ aliquando eliguntur, sed et matres, ed quidem educatrices filiorum;*" while JEROME speaks of it as a standing custom of the church in his days; *ad Nepot:* "*Multas anus alit Ecclesia, quæ officium ægrotanti præstant et beneficium accipiunt ministrando.*" Compare the thorough essay of Mosheim on this passage, whose view has been followed also by Böttcher and Mack. Such widows, called presbyteresses, seem to have had the same relation toward their own sex as the presbyters toward the men; and the later office of deaconess which we find in the ancient church, and which was first established by Canon XI. of the Synod of Laodicea, was only, with certain modifications, the carrying out of the outline here drawn. True, we find no further trace of such an institution in the apostolic letters; but this one is quite sufficient, and the oldest church-fathers also call it an apostolic tradition. Meanwhile, we must observe that the later solemn rites accompanying their institution do not date from the apostolic age; and without doubt it was then marked by the greatest simplicity. When De Wette, *e. g.*, says that the widows sat in a specific place, next to the presbyters in the assembly, with their heads uncovered; that they had an oversight over the women of the church, especially over widows and orphans; that they were invested with the *vestis vidualis*, and consecrated by the laying on of hands: all this belongs, in the main, to a later period. Baur, however, is in worse error, when, on the strength of this passage, he opposes the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles, because he thinks such an institution inconceivable in the apostolic age. He understands by widows, χήρας in the ecclesiastical use of the word; by which, on the ground of IGNAT., *Epist. ad Smyrn.*, *cap.* 3, παρθένοι are intended. But, granted even that there were in the second century virgins who remained unmarried from ascetic motives, and were therefore named χήραι, it does not follow that these women named in the Epistle to Timothy were other than real widows. We conclude, rather, that it was the early custom to choose church-deaconesses from the class of widows; so that widows and deaconesses were almost synonymous terms. The Apostle does not once touch this subject in connection with his remarks on church-

offices and ministerial duties, but in an entirely different place. The young χῆραι, whom Timothy (according to ver. 11) must reject, are not unmarried women, but such as had early lost their husbands, and would be in danger, by a second marriage, of renouncing the service which they had already entered for the benefit of the church. "No ascetic antagonism between a married life and fidelity to Christ is here in the least intended (see chap. ii. 15; v. 14), but an unfaithfulness towards Christ, which consisted in making the office of the deaconess a stepping-stone to marriage;" LANGE, *Apost. Zeitalt.* i. p. 142.

[Our author has ingeniously sought to combine the two more probable of the three explanations. He accepts the view set forth by Mosheim, and defended by the best of recent English expositors, as well as by De Wette, Wiesinger, and Huther, yet he supposes that the order of deaconess was afterwards developed out of this earlier one of female presbyters. Such a view, however, is open to grave objection. There can be little doubt that the deaconess was a recognized officer of the church before Canon XI. of Laodicea formally established the order. See SCHAFF, "Apost. Church," B. 3, ch. 3, p. 135, for a thorough summary of the facts and the several hypotheses. The truth seems to be, that such exact distinctions of class and name do not suit the character of the primitive age. The order doubtless existed before the title was established. We can easily understand that such a χηρῶν χορὸς, or church-widowhood, had its official duty and honor; and as the ranks of church authority became more settled, as the deacon became at last the assistant of the presbyter, so the deaconess, hitherto a general phrase for such ministering women, became an order next to that of the female presbyter. The subject of the primitive deaconess has of late been viewed with special interest. We refer the reader especially to the essay of HOWSON, "Deaconesses," and a recent volume by J. M. LUDLOW, "Woman's Work in the Church." It is clear that in the Greek Church of the second century it was a most active and useful ministry. It aided the clergy in many duties—in baptizing women, in the care of the church-edifice, and in messages of charity. Undoubtedly this order differed in many features from the germ of the primitive day. It had become a semi-clerical office, and had its vow of ordination. No trace of this can be found in the simpler deaconess of the Pastoral Epistles. But it is not to be confounded with the later type of female celibates in the Latin Church; on the contrary, it is a striking feature, that, with the change from the healthy, social life of a Christian womanhood in the church to the conventual life, the order of deaconess passed away. The just abhorrence of the Romish abuse has led the Protestant to lose sight too often of the good which may be wrought by such organized womanly charity, after the pattern not of the convent, but of St. Paul's ἐκκλησία κατ' οἶκον.—W.]

Ver. 10. **Under threescore years old.** Having thus fixed the point of view from which this rule of the Apostle must be regarded, the wisdom of the following instructions becomes clear.—*Not under sixty years of age.* The participle γεγονυῖα belongs to the preceding, not the following words. (The contrary in the *Vulgata: Quæ fuerit unius viri uxor;* and so Luther also.) It denotes the advanced time of life which these widows must have reached. Such persons would with reason be expected not to marry again, but might with undivided hearts dedicate themselves to the service of the church. In accordance with this, Theodosius the Great afterwards established the law: "*Nulla, nisi emensis 60 annis, secundum præceptum Apostoli ad Diaconissarum consortium transferatur.*"—**The wife of one man** (see on chap. iii. 2), who had been once married, but not again; although Paul, in ver. 14, advised second marriage for the younger widows. "It cannot mean that Timothy should not choose a widow who had had several husbands at the same time; for polyandry did not exist among the Greeks, or Jews, or Romans; and even if such a woman had desired church-office, she would have been so marked by public opinion, that a Christian bishop could never have thought of giving her such a charge;" Mack. The cause of this rule was, without doubt, the same as in the case of the presbyter and deacon (see above).—**Well reported of for good works.** The Apostle briefly names many and weighty things required of the χήρα. She must have a good report for good works. Not only must she be beyond objection, but she must be a woman of known moral and devout character. Those good works which are not exclusively works of charity, are regarded as the living sphere (ἐν) in which she has won this good testimony. What works the Apostle chiefly refers to, is plain from the following clauses.—**If she have brought up children,** ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν; whether her own, or the children of a stranger. The idea of a devout, godly training, is not strictly expressed by this word, but an education complete, and so far successful.—**If she have lodged strangers** (comp. chap. iii. 2; Titus i. 8; Rom. xii. 13; Heb. xiii. 2). As hospitality was in all ages an Oriental virtue, it must be a Christian one.—**If she have washed the saints' feet** (comp. John xiii. 15; Luke vii. 44). That which the Lord did in a symbolic way, is here meant in its literal sense, following the common Oriental custom, which the gospel had not abolished.—**If she have relieved the afflicted,** ἐπαρκεῖν (in the New Testament found only here, and in ver. 16). *Afflicted*, not exclusively *paupertate*, Bengel; but afflicted by the manifold evils and accidents of life.—**If she have diligently followed every good work.** A general proposition, in which all before is embraced. The expression, *every good work*, is still stronger than the reference to ἔργοις καλοῖς at the beginning of the verse. It is therefore not to be restricted to charity alone, but has a wider sense. To follow, does not stand here in contrast to *præire*, which is an obligation of men (Bengel), but has the sense of imitate, or pursue (Luther).

Ver. 11. **But the younger widows refuse,** &c., νεωτέρας; not, strictly, all those who have not yet reached the full sixty years; but all, in general, who, in contrast with the aged, belong to the category of the young. *Refuse*, παραιτοῦ; whenever they apply for admission among the deaconesses, in order to enjoy the honor and privilege of the older widows.—**For, when they have begun to wax wanton,** καταστρηνιάσωσι τοῦ Χρ. The word denotes a voluptuous desire, a *pruritus libidinosus*, which leads them into open opposition to Christ, to whom their fidelity was pledged. A formal vow of chastity, like that of the later orders of nuns, was naturally not required of them; and Melanchthon says truly: "*Etiam si tunc consuetudo fuisset faciendi vota, quod non dicit Paulus, tamen ea vota dissimillima fuissent votis monasticis, quæ sine ulla*

dubitatione idolatria." Since the Apostle, however, had directed that the widows mentioned should be married but once, this desire was an inward infidelity to Christ, for whose Church they were now and always to live with undivided hearts.—**They will marry [again]**; an evidence that their purpose was not the indulgence of sensual sin, but a second marriage; and hence the exposition of Jerome is too strong—*quæ fornicatæ sunt.* This, indeed, made them less culpable, yet none the less unfit for the spiritual office.

Ver. 12. **Having damnation.** This design of second marriage has brought condemnation on the young widows (*κριμα = κατάκρισις*); not only a deserved reproach from others, but the judgment of God, who is faithful, on all who are unfaithful to their covenant with Him. [This interpretation seems too strong. It is by no means to be supposed, had St. Paul thought second marriage in any case worthy of such Divine judgment, that he would have advised and even urged it in ver. 14. It is enough to read, *having condemnation*, being worthy of blame. Our commentator seems in this, and all passages relating to women, to have somewhat the tone of a later ascetic like Jerome. We may say the same of the criticism of Calvin on the sex, given with approval by our author, in ver. 13. This harsh spirit must not be made the expositor of the loving, social law of the first Christian family.—W.]—**They have cast off their first faith.** AUGUSTIN, on Psalm lxxv.: "*Voverunt et non reddiderunt.*" According to Calvin, the vow of fidelity made at baptism is here meant; but it is difficult to see why a second marriage should be irreconcilable with this vow. It seems better to suppose, with most expositors, that the allusion is to the vow, which was *implicite*, included in their reception into the common order of widows. They have thereby dedicated themselves exclusively to the service of Christ and His Church; and as they had freely chosen this work, knowing its duties and its restrictions, a second marriage was in this view a breach of troth to Christ.

Ver. 13. **And withal they learn,** &c. The Apostle sees a yet greater evil in the employment of young widows. Not only they have this desire of marriage, but they are withal idle, ἀργαί; thus neglect their duties, and do what they should avoid.—**Wandering about from house to house;** *i. e.*, they are wont to go without good cause. Μανθάνουσι is best connected with περιερχόμεναι. Matthies says rightly: "Μανθάνειν with the participle expresses a disposition which has become a habit; they have the wont of idle gadding about."—**Tattlers also, and busybodies.** They become gossips (φλύαροι: Chrysostom, λάλοι), persons who pry, without being asked, into the business of others, περίεργοι (comp. 2 Thess. iii. 11), speaking things which they ought not; in opposition to all before (comp. τὰ μὴ δεῖ, Titus i. 11). The very character of the duties belonging to the office of deaconess, bringing them in close contact with many persons and social relations, made this temptation doubly perilous. Calvin: "*Istis viduis, honoris prætextu, quod velut publicam personam gerebant, [illegible] quærens aditus patebat. Hanc opportunitatem [illegible] [illegible] ad [illegible] [illegible] (ut fieri solet) et [illegible] [illegible] quæ erant peculiaria sui muneris. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]*

ut ait Plutarchus, carere æquum est, qui simulatque aliquid hauserunt, nunquam cessant, donec effutiverint. Præsertim mulieribus hoc contingit, quæ natura jam propensæ sunt ad loquacitatem nulliusque arcani capaces. Ergo non abs re hæc tria simul conjuncta sunt a Paulo, otium, curiositas et garrulitas."

Ver. 14. **I will therefore,** &c. Paul silently assumes that Timothy will ask how he shall check this evil, and make the young widows, instead of a shame, an honor to the church. Hence, he suggests the wisest course. As, however, compliance with his rule would not, even with the best intentions, depend merely on the widows themselves (Schleiermacher), the *apodictic βούλομαι οὖν* is to be understood not in an absolute, but in a limited sense. If there were nothing to prevent, the young widows (such as are described in vers. 11–13) are counselled to marry—*γαμεῖν*, a word used in 1 Cor. vii. 39 likewise of *second* marriage.—**Bear children,** *τεκνογονεῖν*; a word in which, as in chap. ii. 15, not only the *actus pariendi*, but the training of the children by the mother, should be included.—**Guide the house,** *οἰκοδεσποτεῖν*; mistress of the house—that is, household affairs. Bengel: "*Nubere, liberos gignere, familiam regere—tres gradus societatis domesticæ. Sic habebunt quod agant, citra otium et curiositatem.*" [It is to be noticed how the domestic and social spirit of Christianity appears here in contrast with the conventual morality of later times. St. Paul speaks severely of the conduct of the younger widows; but he must be understood as referring to certain positive cases under his eye of immodest and gossiping women. He does not forbid second marriage, but, ver. 12, their specific transgression of a former promise to devote their lives to church-duty. On the contrary, he urges marriage, true household life, as the best cure for such abuses. It is curious to read in Roman writers—*e. g.*, A Lapide—the attempt to make out of St. Paul's reasoning an implicit argument for the single state. The same false ascetic tendency may be already traced in Tertullian and Augustin, which led to the exalting of virginity as a higher state of Christian piety.—W.]—**Give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully,** *τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ*; perhaps the devil, which ver. 15 does not conflict with; or else in general an adversary, whether in the heathen or the Jewish world; since it must be remarked that Paul viewed the world as under Satanic influences. Should the young widows follow the wrong course, they would give occasion, *ἀφορμήν*, to what? As the final words, *λοιδορίας χάριν*, do not depend on this, but stand by themselves, it seems best here to supply, *occasionem sc. ipsas seducendi*; Huther. The young widows remain idle, curious, and tattling, and the sure consequence is, that the *ἀντικείμενος* finds many opportunities to catch them in his snares; and this would bring reproach on the church, as well as on themselves. *Λοιδορίας χάριν*; properly, to the advantage of reproach; a singular and hard construction (De Wette), yet not more singular than many others which mark the style of the Pastoral Epistles. The adversary is represented as watching his occasion to revile the Church of Christ, and overjoyed at even the appearance of it. There was, indeed, already in the church more than the mere appearance of evil.

Ver. 15. **For some are already turned aside after Satan.** It is plain that *τινες* refers distinctly to some young widows at Ephesus, of

whom unfavorable reports must have reached the ears of the Apostle, although we need not deny that his complaint might have had a wider application. The mention of this was to enforce on Timothy the need of following expressly the counsel given him in ver. 14, since there would else be *periculum in mora*. Ἐξετρ. ὀπίσω τοῦ σατανᾶ does not necessarily mean a complete defection from Christianity, but certainly a walking in paths of error, whether it be heresy or an immoral life. It is possible that some had united themselves in a second marriage with unbelievers, and had thus really severed themselves from the church.

Ver. 16. **If any man or woman that believeth,** πιστὸς ἢ πιστή. Griesbach and Lachmann have, without good reason, omitted the words πιστὸς ἢ (see De Wette and Tischendorf). The Apostle, while he sums here all his remarks on this point, is not content with a mere repetition, but goes still further. The duty which, in ver. 4, he has imposed solely on the relatives of the widows, he now enjoins, so far as circumstances admit, on every believer without distinction. If any have widows, not only in his own household, but in the larger circle of friends or relatives, whose maintenance comes at all within his ability or duty, he should give it, and thus lighten the burden of the church. To explain it of others, of widows wholly deserted, has too narrow a meaning. It would seem that the Apostle especially refers to younger widows, who from selfish economy sought the service of the church; and from whom he could be best relieved (ver. 11) by thus providing for their support.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. It is not only among the requisites, but the weightiest obligations of a pastor of the church, to mingle with every rank and age, as each may need; yet at the same time he should see that the holiness of his office is not endangered, and that the adversary find no occasion for reproach. Paul could without self-boasting, in his exhortation to Timothy, allude to his own excellent example. The highest example, however, is always that of the Chief Shepherd, the Lord of the Church, in the days of His earthly life.

2. As the gospel is an inestimable good for the poor, and pauperism appears in a wholly different form in Christian lands than in those still in darkness and the shadow of death, so it is in regard to the condition of the widow. Widowhood has special cause of gratitude to Christ, in whom the words, "He is a Father of the fatherless, and a Judge of the widow," have had so noble a fulfilment. How vast a difference between the fate of the widow of the Brahmin of highest rank, and the widow of the poorest disciple of the Lord! [A significant illustration of the influence of the Church in this respect may be found in MAINE's "Ancient Law," p. 218: "The provision for the widow was attributable to the exertions of the Church, which never relaxed its solicitude for the interest of widows surviving their husbands; winning, perhaps, one of the most arduous of its triumphs, when, after exacting for two or three centuries an express promise from the husband, at marriage, to endow his wife, it at length succeeded in engrafting the principle of dower on the customary law of all western Europe."]

3. Christianity does not overturn the original order, or free any from the obligations which natural relationship has imposed. Nothing, indeed, is more honored by it than the natural στοργή, the neglect of which is most positively condemned (2 Tim. iii. 3). How holy and indissoluble the tie of children and parents, is first clearly known when we have found in it the true though earthly type of the perfect unity between the Eternal Son and the Holy Father.

4. The office of deaconess in the early church came from the deep craving of Christian women to serve the Lord among their poor associates. It is to the honor of the Romish Church that it encourages its Sisters of Charity to give themselves with noble self-denial to so rare a work; nor can it be denied that Protestantism has too often, in condemning such works of love, rejected alike the good and the evil. We may rejoice that the evangelical Church in our day has come back from this narrow one-sidedness; and the associations of deaconesses already established in many places, with their hospitals and nurseries, are worthy proofs of it.

5. The apparent contradiction in the Apostle's advice to young widows to marry again, and that in 1 Cor. vii. 32 *et seq.*, where he speaks of marriage in an entirely different way, is satisfactorily explained when we recal the difference in times and circumstances. In Corinth, there was a youthful church in possession of manifold gifts, whom the Apostle desired to see dedicated, as far as possible, to the service of the Lord; here, on the contrary, was a disturbance, indeed a retrograde, in a long-established church, for which, therefore, rules of order and discipline were necessary as a step toward a high Christian ideal, wholly above many in the church. In this very difference we have cause to admire the wisdom of the Apostle.

6. It is important, in our church provision for the poor, that the limit which the Apostle here advises be remembered, as well as the enlargement of our charity. The vocation of the deacon is not to entirely support the poor, but to relieve their wants, and to confine the constantly increasing stream of pauperism, as far as possible, within its natural bounds.

7. "*Melius est, cum severitate diligere, quam cum lenitate decipere;*" Augustin.

8. "*Apud templum Hierosolymæ fuerunt mulieres, quæ serviebant coquendo, lavando, sarciendis vestibus, medicatione Levitis et pauperibus. Hunc morem Apostoli imitati transtulerunt et ad Ecclesiam jusserunt eligi grandes natu matronas, quæ ægrotis aut peregrinis servirent, et hæ mercedes habebant ex eleëmosynis, quas Ecclesia tunc liberaliter conferebat. De hoc more loquitur Paulus, non de votis monasticis;*" Melanchthon.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

A seemly conduct in the ministerial office.—The censure of wrong-doers must sometimes be public, but always within due bounds.—The peril of gross and of refined sensuality in the ministry.—Christianity and the state of widowhood: (1.) What Christianity is to the widow; (2.) what widows should be for Christianity.—Children the natural helpers of their needy parents.—The ideal of a Christian widow.—The mirror of the Christian widow.—Alone, yet not alone; John xvi. 32.—What special causes a Christian widow has above others to place her trust in God.—Promises of God to devout widows, and

examples of their support and rescue, especially recorded in the Old Testament.—Every man who provides not for his own household, is worse than a heathen. How this saying is (1.) misused by those who work only for the bread that perisheth; (2.) is forgotten by those who work only for the bread of eternal life, and neglect the care of their nearest kindred.—What is the cause that so many who labor in a larger sphere often overlook the duties which lie nearest to them?—Fidelity in small things and fidelity in great things must ever go hand in hand.—The task and the blessing of a Christian old age.—How even in the garments of sorrow and widowhood we may serve the Lord in His Church.—The widow spiritually dead, and spiritually alive.—The danger of idleness and the blessing of labor.—Better an active vocation for the earth, than pampering the flesh, under pretence of living for heaven.—He is no believer who entirely neglects the care of the poor.—Every Christian man and woman is called within the social circle to be in a measure a deacon or a deaconess.

Starke: Cramer: If we censure wrong-doers, we must consider the age and the persons, that we may make them better, not worse through exasperation, and may avoid all scandal.—Lange's *Opus:* It is as shameful as it is sinful, to give aged women names of ridicule and scorn.—Happy they who grow old in honor (Sir. viii. 7; Prov. xvi. 31).—Cramer: Widows must be honored, not oppressed; for they are privileged persons in the sight of God (Ex. xxii. 22; Ps. lxviii. 6; Sir. xxxv. 17).—Anton: An inferior in his right sphere will be really honored by his superior.—Hedinger: It is a shameful wrong when children, by neglect and extravagance, become so poor that they cannot support their parents (Gen. xlv. 11, 23).—The more the widow is forsaken of men, the nearer she is to God (1 Kings xvii. 12 *et seq.*).—The church is a guild, not of the high and worldly, but of the wretched and suffering who hope in Christ.—Widows may easily fall, and should therefore walk circumspectly, and avoid every appearance of evil, that they may escape calumny (Eph. v. 15).—Hedinger: To call ourselves believers, and do no works of faith, is hypocrisy. Hast thou faith? then show it in Christian duties (James ii. 18).—No church is bound to maintain widows who can earn their bread with their own hands (2 Thess. iii. 12; 1 Kings xvii. 10, 15; Luke iv. 25, 26).—The poor can also help the poor, if not in deeds, yet in wise counsel (Acts xxvii. 8).—When widows marry again, they do not sin (ver. 14; Rom. vii. 3).—Those who have charge of the poor should give good heed how they bestow their alms.—It is a most unchristian scandal, when those who are well-to-do neglect their needy kindred (Isa. lviii. 7).

Heubner: Christianity honors age; it is a sign of decay in a people when age is despised.—A life of pleasure is death to the soul. Compare the excellent exposition by Chrysostom on this passage.—The greatest unkindness is that toward near kindred.—Hereafter, too, Christians will be put to shame by Gentiles (Matt. xi. 41, 42).—We must test the love, before we entrust an office to love.—Widowhood is tempting by its freedom.—Indolence leads to other vices.—The perils of social intercourse.—From Christian families grows the well-being of the Church.—The Christian who receives alms, should ask himself whether they are not needed more by others.

Lisco: How the welfare of a Christian church can be promoted: (1.) By a watchful discipline; (2.) by the conscientious and careful aid of the poor.—The helping women of the church.

Van Oosterzee: Christian women of the apostolic age exhibited as (1.) precursors worthy of love; (2.) examples worthy to be followed; (*a*) in their true Christian, (*b*) their true womanly action; Bonn, 1859.

Von Gerlach: Love expresses itself in various ways, according to the object which it seeks. It is full of zeal for the kingdom of God in its relation to the children, whom it trains up for the Lord; it is generous toward strangers; lowly and obliging toward believers; hopeful toward the suffering; it is all in all.

Baxter: Our way of teaching should be as simple and clear as possible, for it leads a preacher straightest to his mark. Whoso will be understood, must speak to the capacity of his hearers. Truth loves the light, and is most beautiful when it is unveiled. An envious enemy conceals the truth; a hypocrite does it under pretence of teaching it; overwrought, obscure sermons (like painted windows which keep out the light), are often a sign of overdaubed hypocrisy.

B.—Directions touching the Presbyters of the Congregation.—Weighty suggestions for Timothy.

Ch. V. 17–25.

17 Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially
18 they who labor in the [omit "the"] word and doctrine. For the Scripture saith,
Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn.[1] And, The laborer
19 *is* worthy of his reward.[2] Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before
20 two or three witnesses. Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also [the
21 rest also] may fear. I charge *thee* before God, and the Lord [omit "the Lord"]
Jesus Christ[3] [Christ Jesus], and the elect angels, that thou observe these things
22 without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality.[4] Lay hands
suddenly [hastily] on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins: keep thyself
23 pure. Drink no longer water [only], but use a little wine for thy stomach's[5] sake

24 and thine often [thy frequent] infirmities. Some men's sins are open before-
hand [openly manifest], going before to judgment; [,] and some *men* they
25 follow after. Likewise also the good works *of some* are manifest beforehand
[openly manifest]; [,] and they that are otherwise cannot be hid.

[1] Ver. 18.—[The commonly received order of these words is Βοῦν ἀλοῶντα οὐ φιμώσεις. Lachmann, after A. C., reverses it, thus: οὐ φιμ. βοῦν ἀλοῶν.—E. H.]

[2] Ver. 18.—[Instead of μισθοῦ—*Recepta*, Tischendorf, Lachmann—the Sinaiticus has τροφῆς.—E. H.]

[3] Ver. 21.—Received text: *And the Lord Jesus Christ.* Κυρίου to be rejected, beyond question. See Tischendorf on the place.

[4] Ver. 21.—[πρόσκλισιν; see Tischendorf's note. Lachmann has πρόσκλησιν. Cf. Huther.—E. H.]

[5] Ver. 23.—[Lachmann omits σου after στόμαχόν; so also the Sinaiticus.—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 17. **Let the elders.** With these words the Apostle passes to a new precept, closely connected, however, with the preceding. If the poor of the church be supported in the right way, then it is of importance that they be instructed in the right way; but this is impossible so long as worthy ministers are not honored, and unworthy ones not removed from among them. Accordingly Paul takes this opportunity to give some wise suggestions on the subject, from which it is most obvious with what ample power Timothy was invested in the church. Bengel says with reason on ver. 19: "*Habebat ergo Timotheus potestatem judicandi in Ecclesia.*" It lies, moreover, in the nature of the case, that such instructions, although given directly to Timothy himself, must in part at least be put in practice in the church as the occasion should arise.—**That rule well.** The elders who exercise their office well (καλῶς) are not contrasted with those who grossly neglect it, but only with those who distinguish themselves less. Among the ministers, as among the members of the church, eminent men were associated with those of moderate ability. It is of the first the Apostle enjoins, that they be counted worthy of double honor. The τιμή which he claims for them is not merely a pecuniary support, a maintenance in general, to which they have a right, although this is not overlooked (see ver. 18), but the esteem due to them; which is called double, not because it is literally twofold (thus, *e. g.*, Melanchthon: *Duplici honore*, i. e., *victu et reverentia;* others differently, see De Wette), but because it should be shown to them in greater measure than to others (thus Chrysostom, διπλῆς = πολλῆς τιμῆς). Paul would have them esteemed worthy (ἀξιούσθωσαν) by the church, which can show its gratitude to them in no other way. "Upon a casual misinterpretation of this verse was founded the disgusting practice, which prevailed in the third century, of setting a double portion of meat before the presbyters in the feasts of love;" CONYBEARE and HOWSON, vol. ii. p. 472.—**Especially those who labor in the word and doctrine.** The emphasis is on this description of the elders as laboring (κοπιῶντες). No easy post of honor, but a large task was entrusted to them. As laboring in word and doctrine (ἐν here refers to the sphere in which the labor is performed), they have especial claim, from the severity and the dignity of their work. By λόγος we are to understand a discourse, either prophetic or hortatory, while διδασκαλία refers specially to teaching. It has often been attempted, from this μάλιστα of Paul, to draw a marked distinction between the *ruling* and the *teaching* presbyters. The fact was simply this, that in the large field of labor assigned to the Christian presbyters, one felt himself drawn more to this, another to that portion, since the revelation of the Spirit was given to each πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον. But we have seen clearly that Paul honored more those elders who, together with other duties, were engaged especially in the instruction and comfort of believers; because the capacity for this highest gift of the presbyterial office was not found in all.

[No footsteps are to be found in any Christian church of lay elders, nor were there for many hundred years. St. Paul, prescribing Timothy (1 Tim. iii.) how he should stablish the church, passeth immediately from bishops and ministers of the word and sacraments to deacons, omitting these lay elders, that are supposed to lie in the midst between them. The places of Scripture brought to prove this kind of government are three: 1 Tim. v. 17; Rom. xii. 7, 8; 1 Cor. xii. 28. The two latter are too weak to prove the thing in question. Touching the first, some interpret it as noting two parts or duties of the presbyterial office, not two sorts of presbyters; some, that amongst the elders some labored principally in governing, others in teaching and preaching. Thus these words may have a very good and true sense, without pressing the late conceit touching lay elders. FIELD, "Of the Church," B. 5, ch. 26. "The offices of πρεσβύτερος and διδάσκαλος were united, at the date of the Pastoral Epistles, in the same persons; which is shown by διδακτικός being a qualification required in a presbyter; 1 Tim. iii. 2. But though this union must in all cases have been desirable, we find, from this passage, that there were still some πρεσβύτεροι who were not διδάσκαλοι; *i. e.*, who did not perform the office of public instruction in the congregation. This is another strong proof of the early date of the Epistle." CONYBEARE and HOWSON, ii. 472. It must be allowed, however, while this notion of lay eldership has but slight warrant, if any, in Scripture, that the idea which prompted it is not to be lightly passed by. The whole tendency of the later Church was to forget the distribution of the χάρισματα, which was the most living feature of the primitive body, and to identify the Church with the clergy. It would be a great blessing to our modern Christianity, if we could have preacher, pastor, and teacher each in his own sphere. We have lost the flexibility of the apostolic age.—W.]

Ver. 18. **For the Scripture saith, &c.** The Apostle illustrates and confirms his doctrine by Deut. xxv. 4. Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 9, where he has with great emphasis set forth the same argument still more minutely. In our text he cites the words of the Old Testament merely as an instructive parallel, and leaves to the reader the inference *a minori ad majus* in regard to a human laborer. This idea, at first suggested, is now clearly expressed: **And the**

laborer is worthy of his hire. If the phrase λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή be connected with these words, the criticism is right which finds here a proof that the composition of the Epistle was of a later date. The Old Testament contains no passage which could have occurred here to the Apostle (Lev. xix. 33; Ex. xxiv. 14, cannot be meant); and that the saying of the Lord (Luke x. 7; comp. Matt. x. 10) should already be cited here by Paul as γραφή, is as groundless a supposition (comp., however, Wordsworth, *in loco*). But it is wholly unnecessary to refer the words, λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή, to both parts of the verse. The last clause, ἄξιος, κ.τ.λ., seems simply a proverbial expression, which had been used before by the Lord. (Thus also Calvin.) This whole passage shows that the Apostle requires such a τιμή for the presbyters as should be shown in a due provision for their temporal necessities (comp. Gal. vi. 6).

Ver. 19. **Against an elder receive not an accusation.** After Paul has shown how to act toward presbyters who are worthy of honor, he proceeds more exactly to define the conduct of Timothy toward the unworthy. It is obvious that the Apostle does not mean here, by πρεσβύτερος, an old man in the general sense (Chrysostom), but distinctly a presbyter of the church, against whom any accusation might be brought. Timothy must receive no complaint in such cases, except (ἐκτὸς εἰ μή, a well-known pleonasm) before two or three witnesses. This number was required by the Mosaic law (Deut. xvii. 6; Heb. x. 28), and by the Lord Himself in a similar case (Matt. xviii. 16). This decision may have occurred, perhaps, to the mind of the Apostle. Timothy was not to be disturbed by unproved private complaints, but to give due weight to the rights of the presbyterial office, and to condemn no innocent man unheard. "It might easily happen, in a church so large and mixed as the Ephesian, that one or another, from wounded feelings of honor, from mere partisanship, or some selfish motive, would seek to injure a presbyter, and drag him down from his influential position; and against this the precept of the Apostle was the best safeguard" (Matthies). It is noticeable that we have here not ἐπὶ στόματ. δύο μαρτ., but simply ἐπὶ δύο μαρτ. If the preposition be here understood in the sense of *coram*, as ἐπὶ μαρτ. was often used by classical writers in the sense of *before witnesses* (Huther), we have here the rule that the personal presence of the definite number of witnesses must in each case be held necessary; a rule probably designed to save Timothy from the appearance of partiality. But we regard it as more probable that only the testimony of two or three men is here required (De Wette); and there is surely no ground to refer this exclusively (Huther) to complaints affecting the office of a presbyter, but to anything by which the character, public or private, might be in the least degree injured.

Ver. 20. **Them that sin rebuke before all,** &c. According to some, this denotes, in general, sinful members of the church; according to others, sinful presbyters. The last, however, is here the more probable, and the nature of the case itself requires that ἁμαρτάνοντας should be specially understood of grosser crimes; indeed, of those which justly create scandal. The sinful persons are represented as still at the time living in sin, whence the present is used where otherwise the perfect would be expected. The question, again, is whether the following words, **rebuke before all, that others also may fear,** mean the other presbyters, or all the other members of the church. Grammatically, one is as allowable as the other, and both expositions have a sound sense. Since, however, a censure of the guilty presbyter in the hearing of the assembled church was not necessary, and might easily lead to a depreciation of the clerical office, it is perhaps better to suppose a censure *coram consensu presbyterorum;* a rule of unquestionable value, since the associates of the guilty man, who perhaps might be inclined to wrong, would thus be moved by a wholesome fear.

Ver. 21. **I charge thee before God** (comp. 2 Tim. iv. 1). With this solemn attestation the just and faithful execution of all these precepts is impressed on Timothy. Perhaps the mention of the μάρτυρες (ver. 19) led the Apostle naturally to point his friend and scholar to the highest μάρτυς of his life and work. The subject was certainly weighty enough to justify the most solemn charge. Should Timothy forget it, the injury to the church might be incalculable. The cumulative style of the words also proves how heavily this lay on Paul's heart. Bengel says well: "*Repræsentat Timotheo suo judicium extremum, in quo Deus revelabitur et Christus cum angelis coram conspicietur.*" He charges him not alone before God and Jesus Christ (κυρίου is not genuine; see the critical note), but before God and the elect angels. Manifold expositions have been given of this verse, especially in regard to the striking ἐκλεκτῶν. Not to criticise the almost forgotten notion of those who thought this an allusion to distinguished preachers of Christianity, or to the presbyters of the church, we name only the view (Baur) which explains it by the Gnostic fancy of certain angels, who stand in special connection with the Redeemer; a view which would again give internal evidence of the later origin of the Epistle. This argument, however, proves too much, since this conception of elect angels, standing in a special relation to the Lord of the Church, is of genuine New Testament origin (comp. 1 Peter iii. 22; Heb. i. 6, and other places). For our part, we hold it most probable that the Old Testament idea of different ranks and orders of angels passed before the mind of the Apostle, and that he here refers to the highest among them. Conybeare and Howson: "By the chosen angels, are probably meant those especially selected by God as His messengers to the human race, such as Gabriel." The interpretation of the passage as only an *epitheton ornans* (Huther) seems to us somewhat tame. For other views, see De Wette *in loco*.—**That thou observe these things.** Ταῦτα refers to the exhortation immediately before; that is, respecting the presbyters deserving blame (as well as to those worthy of honor?)—**Without preferring one before another,** χωρὶς προκρίματος; without hasty judgment, especially of an unfavorable kind.—**Doing nothing by partiality,** κατὰ πρόσκλισιν. The unjust disposition is meant, which may easily lead us to look on the virtues or faults of others through a magnifying glass or a microscope. If πρόσκλησιν be the true reading (as Lachmann thinks, on the authority of A. D., and other MSS.), then we must infer that the Apostle exhorts Timothy to do nothing *coram judice Romano, ethnico* (Bretschneider), which would give but a very forced sense; and it is therefore simpler to regard this reading as a *lapsus calami*, and to adhere to the common one.

Ver. 22. **Lay hands suddenly on no man.** "*Timothei erat, manus imponere presbyteris;*"

Bengel. But the question is, to what laying on of hands the Apostle here refers. According to De Wette, he means the admission of such as had been excluded from church fellowship. Without doubt the connection favors this opinion; and already at an early day the laying on of hands was practised as a sign of absolution for excommunicated or heretical persons restored into the pale of the church. It is, however, not capable of proof that this was customary in the apostolic age; and as the Apostle here, without further definition, speaks of the laying on of hands as a custom already existing, it is more natural to refer it to the ordination of a presbyter or deacon; an exposition which is also favored by vers. 24 and 25 (comp. chap. iv. 14; Acts vi. 6). The laying on of hands was not merely the mode of communicating spiritual gifts, but a recognition from those who did it, a declaration that they would be accountable for those ordained. If the latter were unworthy, the former shared the guilt. For this reason the clause was added, **neither make thyself partaker of other men's sins.** Timothy gave to each man, in the laying on of hands, evidence of his own esteem; and should it appear afterward that he was, through haste, deceived in the person, then he would reproach himself as in some measure answerable for the consequences of others' sins. In the words, **Keep thyself pure,** the opposite conduct was recommended to him. The meaning of ἁγνόν is too much contracted, if referred merely to chastity and modesty (comp. chap. iv. 12); yet it is too extended, if moral purity in its full extent is included in it. In this connection, purity in respect to the sins of others is here especially impressed upon Timothy. As to this whole precept (ver. 22), Melanchthon's words deserve citation: "*Complectitur utilem doctrinam. Primum confirmat vocationem et ordinationem, quæ fit per homines in Ecclesia, quia approbat ordinationem, quam Timotheus faciebat imponens manus iis, quos Ecclesia vel ipse elegerat; altera admonitio hæc est, quod vult fieri explorationem doctrinæ et morum, etc.*"

Ver. 23. **Drink no longer water.** It may seem, in a superficial view, that this counsel of Paul is of trivial value, and, in this connection, strange and without purpose. As to the last point, much must undoubtedly be allowed to the free, artless style of this letter to his friend and pupil; while again the words just before, *Keep thyself pure*, would give the Apostle a fit occasion, from the close union of soul and body, to prescribe to Timothy this change in his previous course of life. That Timothy in this respect may have been under the fetters of a false asceticism (Wiesinger), can hardly be supposed; and as little (Otto) that he was in danger of being warped in his judgment by the Gnostics, who forbade the use of wine, or at least required abstinence from it as necessary for progress in the Gnosis. It is more probable that the effort to check the excess of others by his own example, had led him gradually to too rigid a diet. But those who followed Gnostic or Essenian views might meanwhile make a misuse of his example, while his own health, apparently not very firm, was liable to injury. Hence the exhortation, **Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake;** literally, be no longer a water-drinker. According to WINER, *Gramm.*, 6th ed., p. 442, ὑδροποτεῖν means, to use water as a customary and exclusive drink. Whoever drinks a little wine, of course ceases to be a water-drinker in this sense; and therefore μόνον need not be connected in thought with these words. The reason of this friendly advice is added in the clause, **for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities.** Chrysostom: ὅσον πρὸς ὑγίειαν, οὐ πρὸς τρυφήν. If this, however, be the only ground of this whole injunction, then there is not, indeed, the slightest connection between it and what precedes or follows. It is still possible that his fear lest Timothy might too strictly understand his command to keep himself pure, drew this advice from the Apostle. The conjecture (Heydenreich) is a desperate one, that this is an interpolation, to be thus explained: that the parchment was finished, and, for the rest of the letter, a new leaf was added at ver. 24. After all was done, this remark, contained in ver. 23, occurred to the Apostle; but there was no room on the last leaf, and therefore he wrote it on the parchment, closing with ver. 22, at the end of which a little space may have been left. "So might I have done, had I been Paul!" Better be content to read in this verse a clear proof of the genuineness of the Epistle, since surely it could never have entered the mind of any romancer for any conceivable purpose to have written it. [Paley has urged this keenly, as a proof of the genuineness of the Epistle. "Imagine an impostor sitting down to forge an epistle in the name of St. Paul. Is it credible that it should come into his head to give such a direction as this—so remote from everything of doctrine or discipline, of public concern to the religion or the church, or to any sect, order, or party in it? Nothing but reality, the real valetudinary situation of a real person, could have suggested it. . . . The direction stands between two sentences, as wide from the subject as possible. Now, when does this happen? It happens when a man writes as he remembers. In actual letters, in the negligence of a real correspondence, such examples frequently take place; seldom in any other production." *Horæ Paulinæ*, ch. 12, No. 4.—W.]

Ver. 24. **Some men's sins are open beforehand, going before to judgment,** &c. A general observation (vers. 24, 25), with which this part of the Epistle closes, and one which as truly proves Paul's wisdom, and knowledge of human nature, as it was fitted for the wants of Timothy in church discipline, and especially in the appointment of the ministry. It would lead him to forethought, since a hasty judgment, whether favorable or not, would be followed by such frequent deception (comp. 1 Cor. iv. 5).—*Are open beforehand*, πρόδηλοι; not strictly, are manifest beforehand, but, before the eyes of all (comp. Heb. vii. 14, where the same word is used, not in relation to time, but place).—*Going before to judgment*, εἰς κρίσιν; in other words, they go as heralds before them (as an evil report outstrips a man) to a judgment, which therefore is beyond all doubt. The Apostle would say, that with such men no special foresight is requisite; they constantly condemn themselves; but it is not so with others.—**Some men they follow,** &c., *sc.* εἰς κρίσιν; *i. e.*, their sins are first known after and by the judgment, not known beforehand, like the first-named. In regard to those whose character is not yet clear, circumspection in our judgment cannot be too strongly urged.—**They follow after,** ἐπακολουθοῦσιν. "*Interim patienter exspectandum, dum res se aperiat, nec inquirendum morosius. Fidelem servum tamen regit Deus, ut opportuna agat et dicat. Præpositio* ἐπὶ *dicit intervallum non longum;*" Bengel. This

verse has indeed the character of a common proverb (Huther); but it does not follow that κρίσις is to be understood in a merely general sense, much less that it signifies exclusively a moral tribunal (De Wette). We must rather believe that the Apostle means the judgment at the advent of Christ, as the goal toward which all sins and all good works proceed; some before their possessors, others after them; some before the eyes of the world, others hidden from men, until at the last judgment, whether known before or not, they are brought fully into the light.

Ver. 25. **Likewise also the good works.** What the Apostle has said above in regard to particular sins, he applies now to good works. **Likewise also the good works are manifest beforehand.** Some have been for a long time known, and there could be no doubt of them. It was not so, however, with all good works, and therefore he continues: **and they that are otherwise,** *i. e.*, those good works which are not yet manifest, **cannot be hid**; they come earlier or later by their own true nature to the light. This is said as a consolation to Timothy, in case he should be troubled by the thought that the doers of many good works would remain perhaps unknown to him, and might thus be overlooked in the choice of presbyters in the church. If we interpret *they that are otherwise* as meaning evil works, the parallel fails, and we have only a weak repetition of ver. 24. The harmony demands that ver. 25 be explained as referring wholly to good works; ver. 24 to evil works. According to De Wette, both observations mean very little; according to Bengel, we have here, on the contrary, an *insigne dictum et hodie observandum.* We agree with the latter.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. It is a duty which the church should hold dear, to provide amply for the support of its teachers. The neglect or disregard of this duty leads to an injury which falls back on itself. The minister must always remember the word of the Lord: "Freely ye have received, freely give;" but the church, for its own interest, should not wish this rule applied too literally. It cannot be denied, too, that a certain independence of the minister of the gospel, in his individual relation to the members of the church, is greatly to be desired.

2. In respect to the proper discipline which, according to God's word, must be exercised over the ministers of the church, there are two perils equally to be avoided. The maxims of *espionage*, of intimidation, of suspicion, of censure in regard to the most trivial things, have at all times borne bitter fruit. But there can be as little good from that moral latitudinarianism, that false indulgence which is so often seen on the other side. The best discipline for the spiritual office is, however, that which the pastor, by the light of the word and the Spirit of God, exercises over himself.

3. Even if the word be purely preached and the sacraments duly administered, yet the church remains unfaithful to its calling if it has no desire or power to remove bad men from its midst (comp. 1 Cor. v. 13). But, on the other side, those who rightly mourn over the decay of church discipline, often forget that the chief ministers of the church cannot judge upon reports without evidence; that they must have substantial proof; and that all things must be sustained by the word of two or three witnesses, who, when the trial comes, are usually missing.

4. The doctrine of various ranks and orders in the angelic world is no fruit of Jewish superstition or heathen theosophy, but of the Divine revelation (see the book of Daniel, and the different suggestions in Luke i. 19; Eph. i. 21; Col. i. 16). The error of the speculative gnosticism here lay in its results and its method, but not, however, in its ground-ideas. Even sound reason must find it probable, *à priori*, that the spiritual world, the realm of freedom, must be the scene of the richest variety. It cannot, then, surprise us that Paul in this place charges Timothy by the elect angels, when we reflect that, according to the Apostle's own teaching, the heavenly powers have the most lively sympathy with the weal and woe of the Church of Christ (Eph. iii. 10; comp. 1 Peter i. 12).

5. Christianity is as far removed from a sensual and epicurean view of life, as from a stoical and ascetic one.

6. He who, from the precept of Paul in respect to drinking water and wine, doubts the inspiration of this Epistle, must have the most superficial idea of inspiration. If, indeed, we suppose the Apostle moved by the Spirit to write mechanically and passively what it dictated, then sentences like the preceding are strange indeed (comp. 2 Tim. iv. 13). But he who holds that the whole personality of the Apostle was filled and interpenetrated by the Spirit, so as to be guided by it as well in a word of advice to a friend as in the weightiest rules for the welfare of the church, or in revealing the mysteries of the future, will not even in such seemingly slight things deny the presence of that Spirit, to whom, because He is divine, nothing can be too great, nothing too insignificant. On this whole verse, compare further the seventeenth Homily of CHRYSOSTOM (*De Statuis, ad populum Antioch.*)

[7. The reading, "Be no longer a water-drinker," brings out more fully the Pauline view of temperance. Indeed, this trivial allusion, like almost all the sayings of the Apostle, involves an ethical principle. Christianity commands temperance: but it plants the law of it in the character, and so makes the man able to judge between use and abuse. To put instead of this a law of total abstinence, is not gospel ethics, but the very asceticism which Paul rebukes in the false teachers of his time.—W.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Among the rulers of the church, we meet with men of mediocrity more often than of high ability; but we must despise neither of them, although the latter have the greatest honor.—The laborer is worthy of his hire: (1.) No work without reward; (2.) no reward without work; (3.) no work and reward except according to the rule of Scripture.—No man can be condemned unheard with less justice than the minister of the word.—The object of church discipline is not only corrective, but prohibitive.—With God there is no respect of persons; it should be even so with men.—How must a Christian act in judging the faults of another? (1.) Cautious in condemning a brother; (2.) Strictly watchful over himself.—The union of love and earnestness which we should show toward the offences of others (comp. Mark iii. 5).—The Christian and the false Gnostic asceticism.—Even Timothy had a thorn in the flesh.

—Care for the body is necessary even for the minister of the Lord.—Not too hasty prepossessions in our intercourse with men, yet no unloving distrust.—The day brings everything to light (1 Cor. iii. 13).

STARKE: OSIANDER: The weaknesses of a minister of the church should indeed be so far kept from publicity, that the worthiness of his office of preacher may not be despised; yet great and manifest sins must not go unpunished, that the church may know that what is rebuked in the hearers, cannot be right in their ministers.—HEDINGER: The holy angels are also in the assembly of the Lord, and hence we should be blameless (1 Cor. xi. 10).—Thou flatterest thyself thou hast not committed this or that sin; but if thou hast in any way helped it on, it is the same as if thou thyself hast done it (Rom. i. 32).—Be comforted by this example, ye servants of God who are weak and sickly in body. Ye can nevertheless be useful to the Church of God.—ANTON: There is no web so fine-spun, but at last it comes out in the sunlight.—OSIANDER: The church does not judge private and hidden things. What is manifest, we must reform; but what is hidden, we must leave to God, the righteous Judge (1 Cor. iv. 5).

HEUBNER: A moderate, scanty salary should be a school of discipline for the true, pure, heavenly spirit.—Church discipline is essentially different from civil or temporal.—An evil ground in the heart cannot long remain undiscovered.—A Christian judgment of the character of others.—Christianity throws light on the knowledge of men.—The worth of a good reputation.—VON GERLACH: It does not show regard for the ministerial office, when the offences of the pastor are concealed and gilded over, but when they are specially punished.—LISCO (on vers. 17–21): The love which should be shown to the ministers of the church: (1.) Generous; (2.) forbearing love.—The discipline which pastors should exercise over one another.—(*Synodal Sermon*) on vers. 22–25: On true prudence in the appointment of the ministry: (1.) In what it consists; (2.) Why it is necessary.—A timely exhortation and a sure foresight.

XII.

Various Prescripts, Warnings, and Exhortations.

CH. VI. 1–21.

A.—The obligation of Christian slaves.—Warning against false teachers.—Praise of moderation, and warning against covetousness.

CH. VI. 1–10.

1 Let as many servants as are [as many as are servants] under the yoke count
their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and *his* doctrine
2 be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise
them, because they are brethren;[1] [,] but rather do *them* service, because they
are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit [who are partakers of the
3 benefit]. These things teach and exhort. If any man teach otherwise, and consent[2] not to wholesome words, *even* the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and
4 to the doctrine which is according to godliness; [,] He is proud, knowing
nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy,
5 strife, railings, evil surmisings, Perverse disputings[3] of men of corrupt minds,
and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness [godliness is a
6 means of gain]: from such withdraw thyself.[4] But godliness with contentment
7 is great gain. For we brought nothing into *this* world, *and it is* certain[5] we
8 can carry nothing out. And having food and raiment, let us be therewith [with
9 these] content. But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and
into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and per-
10 dition. For the love of money is the [a] root of all evil: [,] which while some
coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through
with many sorrows.

[1] Ver. 2.—[The words ὅτι ἀδελφοί εἰσιν are wanting in the Sinaiticus.—E. H.]
[2] Ver. 3.—[The Sinaiticus, in contrast with the other witnesses, has προσέχεται.—E. H.]
[3] Ver. 5.—[Instead of the received reading, all the authorities have διαπαρατριβαί.—E. H.]
[4] Ver. 5.—According to A. D. F. G., and others, these words are to be regarded as a spurious addition, and are consequently left out by Tischendorf. They are not in the Sinaiticus [nor in Lachmann.—E. H.].
[5] Ver. 7.—[δῆλον: no competent authority for this word, although retained by Tischendorf. It is omitted by Lachmann; nor is it in the Sinaiticus.—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **Let as many servants as are under the yoke,** &c. [Under the yoke, as bondservants. Δοῦλοι is not the subject, but an explanatory predicate; Ellicott, *in loco*.—W.] The Apostle begins in this chapter to give counsel for various classes in the community, as he has before set forth whatever is required of its overseers and officers. At the outset he directs Timothy as to the duty of those members of the church who belong to the condition of slaves (vers. 1, 2). It was not strange that such persons should think themselves placed, by their Christian profession, in a changed relation toward both their heathen and their converted masters. They might pervert the doctrine of a Christian freedom, or they might find in the Jewish law, by which slaves were released every seventieth or Sabbatic year, some reason to withdraw, sooner or later, wholly or partly, from the yoke. It was therefore necessary to urge on them the duty of a constant subordination (comp. Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii. 22; Titus ii. 1, 9, 10; 1 Peter ii. 18). Christianity does not abolish slavery at once, in opposition to law; but, on the contrary, the bondmen must, through their true Christian conduct, offer a living letter of commendation, to be read by all, of the true and living character of Christianity. To further this end, the Apostle counsels how Christian slaves (ver. 1) are to demean themselves toward unbelieving (ver. 2) and believing masters.—*Let as many as are servants under the yoke.* Not referring directly to such as were treated with special severity, but, in general, to the oppressive character of slavery.—**Count their own masters worthy of all honor.** Almost the same literal injunction given in regard of the presbyter, in chap. v. 17. The Apostle points to a τιμή, which dwells in the heart, and is thence exhibited in the words, demeanor, conduct.—**That the name of God**—of the true God, whom the Christian slaves honored, in contrast with their idolatrous masters—**and the doctrine**—viz., of God (comp. Titus ii. 10), the divine gospel—**be not blasphemed;** which would doubtless be the case should the Christian slaves be guilty of disorderly action. In another place (Rom. ii. 24) the Apostle accuses the Jews, because through them the name of God was blasphemed among the heathen; and it was counted the greatest sin of David (2 Sam. xii. 14), that he had made the enemies of God to blaspheme. The warning of the text is designed to prevent a like danger.

Ver. 2. **And they . . . exhort.** Christian slaves, who, on the other hand, have the privilege of believing masters, might easily forget that they who, as believers, were their brethren, yet had another relation as their superiors, and might thus withhold the honor due to them. The Apostle strongly opposes this exaggerated view of Christian freedom and equality.—**They that have believing masters**—[see Trench, "Synon.," § 28, on the distinction between δεσπότης and κύριος. The former signifies the relation to those who have been bought, who are owned as property; the latter the family headship, the relation of the man to wife and children. It is to be observed that in his other Epistles St. Paul uses κύριος as the general title.—W.]—(πιστοὺς is placed before emphatically) **let them not despise them, because they are brethren;** *i. e.*, the masters. Such a contempt is meant here as would wholly, or in part, lose sight of the natural difference between master and slave. There is no respect of persons before God; but before man the divisions of social rank must be held in due regard.—**But rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved.** It is almost unexplainable, that both these last objections should have been thought to refer either to the slaves (Wetstein), or to masters and slaves together (Matthies). It is plain that the Apostle here expressly distinguishes the masters, and in such wise, indeed, as to persuade the slaves to honor and revere them. As believers in Christ and beloved of God, the masters can claim peculiarly the respect of their Christian bondmen. It is a harder question, what the Apostle means by the words: **partakers of the benefit,** οἱ τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι; [*qui participes sunt;* Vulgate.—W.] We might, perhaps, suppose that εὐεργεσία = χάρις, signifying the blessing of Christianity (comp. Rom. i. 7; thus Heydenreich and others). But this thought is already expressed in ἀγαπ. and πιστοί, and would thus be only an empty tautology. It is then better to understand, by εὐεργεσία, the faithful service of the slaves, so that the sense should be: slaves ought so much more to serve believing masters, because they who receive such service are believers and beloved. The remembrance that a true service, done from a Christian principle, would be a benefit to the believing masters, was indeed well calculated to persuade Christian slaves.—**These things teach and exhort.** A direct reference, as in chap. iv. 11; v. 7, to what has been said just before.

[This exposition, while it seems true to the letter, is untrue to the principle of Christianity. Undoubtedly St. Paul did not attempt to abolish slavery. But when it is inferred from this that the moral action of the primitive Church gives us the complete standard for all time, it is a *petitio principii.* The Church of that day was composed of men who had no political or civil ties outside their little body; to them, all else was "the world" of heathendom. It was enough for St. Paul to inculcate the law of love, and leave the larger question of Roman slavery to the future. But when Christianity became the religion of the State, and its believers citizens, there arose a new, definite sphere of social duty outside the church relationship. It may, indeed, be proven from this passage, that slavery is not absolutely and in all cases a sin, like lying or stealing; that, like polygamy, it may be one of the phases of social growth. But to say that, because Christian philanthropy did not then touch it, it may now claim the sanction of Christianity, is monstrous.—We might, indeed, draw from this very passage one of the strongest arguments against the modern apologist. St. Paul does not counsel masters to be kind, but slaves *not to despise* their masters, *because* they are *brethren.* The tone of the whole proves that slavery in that Christian community was hardly a yoke at all. What would the slaveholders of our Christian time think of a bishop who should mildly beg bondmen to treat a master with respect, not scorn him, because he was a brother?—But we take here the largest ground. To say that Christianity is to-day confined within the limits of St. Paul's action, is to say that in 1800 years it has wrought no change in the world it came to reform. It is to say, that it is behind Judaism at that very time; for slavery, under the teaching of humane Rabbis, had in St. Paul's day almost wholly

vanished from Palestine. It is to narrow Scripture; it is to narrow Christian ethics; it is to narrow Christian history. Civilization has, step by step, been fulfilling the first prophecy of the Lord, that He came to "break every yoke." As early as the code of Justinian, we have the statement of the maxim, "*Cum jure naturali omnes liberi nascerentur;*" *Cod. Just., lib. i. tit.* 5. It was a social law which the early Christian himself had not grasped: it was the new growth of social ethics. Christian jurisprudence and Christian philanthropy have only interpreted it. We may well demand, at this day, that Scriptural criticism shall no longer make the word of God the apologist of social wrong.—W.] *

Ver. 3. **If any man teach otherwise,** &c. The Apostle proceeds from the slaves to the false teachers. The connection of his thoughts seems this: that the false teachers have proposed dangerous maxims in regard of Christian freedom and order, which might, if they spread further, mislead the bondmen. We may thus understand the ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν definitely of corrupt maxims concerning the topics just discussed, although we may add that the Apostle takes occasion here, as in other passages of these Epistles, to point out and oppose false doctrines in general. Their character is here described, and their condemnation given with a fulness of language that might seem somewhat irrelevant, if we do not consider how dangerous such false teachers were, and how sad their corrupting influence on many.—**And consent not.** This more definite expression now marks the false teachers as men who were directly hostile to the gospel doctrine, which is enjoined by St. Paul as the fountain and touchstone of the truth.—*Consent not* (μὴ προσέρχεται), naturally signifies that acceptance, in a spiritual view, which leads of itself to agreement (*accedere opinioni, alicui accedere*). The **words** of the Lord are spoken of **as wholesome**, in contrast with the diseased character of the false doctrines (comp. νοσῶν, ver. 4); and the truth of the gospel is here named as **according to godliness** (κατ' εὐσεβ.), to show the indivisible unity between Christian truth and morality, in consequence of which any, who has mistaken the latter, has already in himself the sentence of his condemnation. [Not "*quæ ad pietatem ducit,*" but "*quæ pietati consentanea est;*" Ellicott. —W.] Since Christianity directly quickens and demands godliness, a lax morality cannot have union with it. The Apostle now proceeds, vers. 4 and 5, to show the sources and effects of each grievous error.

Ver. 4. **He is proud . . . strifes of words.** A darkened understanding is the first characteristic which St. Paul ascribes to such an errorist (τετύφωται); he is beclouded, wholly blinded, from his proud conceit (comp. Eph. iv. 18); **knowing nothing [aright]**; the result of the former vice. He who is blinded in his view of the whole, cannot possibly look at particulars from a right point of sight. To judge truly the special truths of Christianity, must require, in some measure, a knowledge of its whole character. To this sad state of the mind there is added a yet more melancholy state of the heart.—**But doting about questions and strifes of words,** νοσῶν περὶ ζητ., κ.τ.λ. The proposition declares the objects in regard to which this disease is manifest. The false teacher is unhappily busied with ζητήσεις and λογομαχίας. He is tormented with the pursuit of those beyond the good and needful limit; and while he perhaps believes that he may attain the right result, he opens for himself and others a source of deep wretchedness. What else can be the end of all these strifes? (see below.)—**Whereof cometh,** &c., ἐξ ὧν, *sc.* ζητήσεις καὶ λογομαχίας.—**Envy, strife, railings;** not directly against God (Chrysostom), but rather against other men.—**Evil surmisings.** "*Suspiciones malæ, per quas ii, qui non statim omnia assentiuntur, invidi putantur;*" Bengel.

Ver. 5. **Perverse disputings;** παραδιατριβαί, according to the common reading, to which, however, another (διαπαρατριβαί) deserves the preference (see Tischendorf). The first denotes useless disputation, the other, growing hostilities and conflicts (comp. WINER, *Gramm.*, p. 92).—**Men of corrupt minds, destitute of the truth.** The Apostle states here the deepest ground of this blindness, which he has described in ver. 4. Here, too, the corrupt heart is, in his view, the abyss out of which proceeds the darkness which obscures the spiritual vision. "This and the preceding participial clause denote, therefore, that the errorists were before unperverted, and in possession of the truth; but both these royal jewels have been forfeited, and, according to chap. iv. 1, through demoniacal influence;" Huther. As a signal proof of the extent of this perversion, the Apostle adds the following.—**Supposing that gain is godliness.** This trait completes the sketch of the false teachers, who thus appear as unprincipled hypocrites, abusing the spiritual gifts they had received to their selfish ends (comp. 2 Tim. iii. 5). Εὐσέβεια is not here the objective religion, which is ἡ κατ' εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλία (ver. 3), but godliness in a subjective sense, the religious spirit, or piety. This was regarded by the heretics as πορισμός, a source of secular gain. They put on the guise of godly, conscientious men, from pure selfishness. A show of Christian life was in their view a lucrative business (Titus i. 11, a trade; Luther); and they may be thus called an order of Jesuits before Loyola, since they followed in this the rule, that "the end sanctifies the means." The contempt of the Apostle for such worthless men is seen in his choice of words; and Timothy hardly needed the express exhortation, "From such withdraw thyself," which is not in the original text (see Critical notes).

[There is a singular likeness between this sketch of the false teachers, and the Sophists so keenly portrayed in Plato as the opponents of Socrates. Their philosophy was a mere dialectic hair-splitting, without any moral truth—a λογομαχία, a word-fighting; and the ζητήσεις of this Epistle answer exactly to the captious, questioning style of the Greek schools. As a last feature, they were χρηματιστάι, and boasted that they sold their wisdom to the youth of Athens. See *Gorgias*, c. 7; *Protag.*, c. 3. It was the same empty, immoral *sophistomania*, cropping out in this refined Jewish-Christian shape.—W.]

Ver. 6. **But godliness with contentment is great gain.** It might be thought that the Apostle denied godliness to be in any sense a πορισμός. To correct so wrong an inference from his words, he would show how far godliness gives true success; and this leads him to a full view, reaching to the end of ver. 10, of the Christian contentment. Ἔστι δὲ πορισμός. Godliness is the very reality, although in another and higher sense, which these errorists pervert.—With contentment. If it be closely joined with contentment, then it is a nobler gain. In this concise and weighty meaning the Apostle expresses both these main ideas, that godliness makes us con-

* [On the relation of Paul to slavery, comp. also the remarks of the Am. Ed. in Com. on Ep. to Philemon.—P. S.]

tent, and to be content is the highest good. "*Eleganter, non sine ironicâ correctione in contrarium sensum, eadem verba mox retorquet, ac si dixisset; perperam illi et nequiter, qui venalem habent Christi doctrinam, quasi vere pietas esset quæstus. Ideo autem sic vocat, quod plenam et absolutam beatitudinem nobis afferi. Ita vero felicitas in pietate sita est, hæc vero sufficientia est veluti quoddam auctorium;*" Calvin.

Ver. 7. **For we brought nothing into this world.** In this and the following verses the Apostle shows the many grounds of this Christian αὐτάρκεια. The first lies in the very nature of those worldly things for whose possession the unsatisfied man strives. They are not our lawful property, but a loan, received at our birth, to be soon surrendered at the first summons. As we brought nothing into this world (comp. Job i. 21), it is certain we can carry nothing out (comp. Ps. xlix. 17, 18; Luke xii. 15–21). The absence of δῆλον in A. F. G., ver. 17, seems to us a mere error of the MSS., since this word can hardly be dispensed with. It is hence justly restored by Tischendorf, in his 7th edition, although he had before erased it.

Ver. 8. **And having food and raiment, let us,** &c. A second reason for contentment, because men have fewer real wants than they commonly suppose.—*Having food and raiment*, διατροφὰς καὶ σκεπάσματα; both words ἅπαξ λεγόμ.: that which serves for the nourishment and clothing of the body; under the latter, shelter also should be understood. "Ἔχοντες, *habentes, implicite affirmatur, nos habituros esse;*" Bengel.—**Let us be therewith content,** ἀρκεσθησόμεθα. The future may here be considered perhaps as an exhortation. (Let us then be content; Luther). It is simpler, however, to take it in the ordinary sense, as that which may be reasonably expected. The folly of discontent is thus at once recognized.

Ver. 9. **But they that will be rich,** &c. A third reason of αὐτάρκεια, the sad result of the opposite state. (The Vulgate is logically right, but not strictly grammatical, *nam qui volunt,* &c.)—*That will be;* βουλόμενοι, not θέλοντες. Bengel justly says: "*Hæc voluntas animi suâ sorte contenti, inimica, non ipsæ opes, quas idcirco divites non jubentur abjicere*" (vers. 17–19).—**Fall into temptation;** that is, into the temptation to increase their worldly goods in an unjust way.—**And a snare,** καὶ παγίδα. They are thereby fettered, and led captive by evil; with what results, appears directly after.—**And many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition.** The last two words strengthen each other, and may perhaps be distinguished by applying the former to the destruction of the body, the latter to the perdition of the soul. It is arbitrary, in any case, to refer them wholly to moral corruption (De Wette), into which they are already so sunken as to be incapable of any further degree; or to eternal perdition (Huther), because that is only the complete manifestation of what is aleady begun on earth. The here and hereafter in this warning of St. Paul must not be wilfully disjoined. But that he has not spoken too strongly here, is proved by the next verse.

[The force of the compound form ἀπώλ., and the more abstract termination of the latter word, perhaps, give a hint that a climactic force is intended; ὄλεθρος is destruction in a general sense, whether of body or soul; ἀπώλεια intensifies it, by pointing mainly to the latter; Ellicott, *in loco*.—W.]

Ver. 10. **For the love of money is the root of all evil.** The omission of the article before ῥίζα should be understood. [A root; Alford, Conybeare and Howson; see, however, Ellicott for the other view.—W.] St. Paul does not say that the root of all evil is the desire of money, in which case this would be here represented as the source of all other sins—a view opposed as well to sound sense as to daily experience—but he only enumerates together the κακά springing out of the φιλαργυρία; although it is as true that the same can be said of other sins; ambition, lust, indeed every evil passion which masters mankind. Yet it must be acknowledged that there is no sin which so entirely rules, influences, and hardens men against every better feeling, as this. (This is contrary to De Wette *in loco*.) This love of money (φιλαργυρία) not merely signifies the lust for gaining money in all possible ways, but the desire of keeping it at every cost.—**Which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith;** ἧς. sc. φιλαργυρίας. As this last is an ὄρεξις, it must be granted that the connection of thought seems not quite correct, since, in a strict sense, the money itself, not the love of it, is the object of such toilsome effort. The sense is, however, clear enough; and it is therefore needless to explain ὀρέγεσθαι in the sense of *deditum esse;* Matthies. Whoever thirsts after money, seeks at the same time to satisfy his passion with his whole power, and thus he wanders from true Christian faith (comp. chap. i. 6, 19), and **has pierced himself through with many sorrows.** The ὀδύναι, here imaged as a sword piercing the soul (Luke ii. 35), and leaving a deep wound, are the pangs of conscience which the covetous feel when their eyes are opened to the shameful means they have used toward the end. They are, further, the forewarning of that ἀπώλεια whereof the Apostle has spoken in the previous verses. Personal recollections of this or that covetous man may have risen to his mind. Instead of περιέπειραν, *transfixerunt*, some critics have περιέσπειραν—a reading on which the Vulgate translation rests (*inseruerunt*), signifying that they have surrounded their life with pain, as with a hedge of thorns. It is clear, however, that the *Recepta*, which critically is far better sustained, gives us likewise a much stronger sense.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The injunction of the Apostle in regard of slavery is important, because it defines, simply and exactly, the relation of Christianity to it. The gospel sustains indeed the principle of the new philanthropy, *servitium humani generis flagitium;* and condemns all abuse of the slave by the master. But on the other hand, where bondage exists, it will in no way release the slave from his duty to his master. It prepares the way for a better condition, but it does not abolish this as by a magic stroke. Freedom, equality, fraternity, in the revolutionary sense of the word, are positively an unchristian sentiment; and the boundary line is here sharply drawn between revolution and reformation. The freedom to which the Lord calls his disciples is not an egoistic, individual one, which severs all bonds, but the freedom to do good in our allotted sphere, and to serve others through love.

[This sentence has in it a weighty side of Christian truth, but it may be made that half-truth which

his whole error. The gospel morality does not teach mere political equality; it does not upturn the just distinctions of social rank; but, while it first purifies the heart, it seeks also to abolish unsocial caste. It does not teach the slave to revolt; but it does pronounce slavery an institution debasing both to mind and body, and at war with the growth of Christianity. An Epictetus may be inwardly free in bonds; but his virtue does not justify servitude. The *quietism* here taught, which severs the Church of Christ from social philanthropy, like Simeon the Stylite in the desert, has too often proved itself the worst egoism, that of a selfish or an emasculated piety.—W.]

2. Here the Apostle commends a practical godliness, in his hostility to all strifes of words. "*Dicat autem aliquis, unde discernam quæstiones utiles ab inutilibus? Respondeo, norma est fundamentum, ut Paulus inquit* (1 Cor. iii. 11). *Complectitur autem fundamentum scripta prophetica et apostolica, et illustre discrimen est legis et evangelii. Item justitia fidei et operum. Item veri cultus, a Deo instituti et falsi cultus ab hominibus instituti, etc. Intra has metas coercendæ sunt cogitationes, et frenanda est curiositas, et prorsus fugiendæ sunt illæ pestes, ostentatio argutiorum, sophistomania et amor contentionis;*" Melanchthon, on ver. 3.

3. The warning of the Apostle against avarice recalls the impressive words of the Lord, especially in the parable, Luke xii. 15–21. Compare also with this the excellent sermon of AD. MONOD, *L'ami de l'argent*, Paris, 1848; handled in part like the essay of HARRIS, "Mammon, or Covetousness the Sin of the Church." It is clear, from Phil. iv. 11–13, how far Paul himself had advanced in the art of the Christian *αὐτάρκεια*.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Christianity and slavery.—The love of freedom, and the service of love.—Woe to him through whom the offence cometh (Matt. xviii. 7).—The Christian and the unchristian communism.—The old heresies in many respects types of the new.—Arrogance and ignorance go commonly hand in hand.—Vers. 3–5. Heresy: (1.) Its characteristics; (2.) its sources; (3.) its results.—Error, the caricature of truth.—The connection of godliness and contentment. Godliness (1.) makes content; (2.) brings great gain.—Three motives to contentment: (1.) We really possess nothing (ver. 7); (2.) we really need nothing (ver. 8); (3.) we become poorer in happiness the richer we become in worldly things (ver. 9, 10).—Avarice a root of all evil: (1.) As every cardinal sin; (2.) more than any other cardinal sins.—Avarice the most utter egoism, in its diametrical hostility to the gospel of love.—The many examples from sacred and secular history which confirm the power of avarice.—The friend of Mammon his own enemy.

STARKE: ANTON: Man is inclined to leap beyond his sphere; but such aims are unwise (Rom. xii. 16; Sir. iii. 19).—Spiritual brotherhood overturns no civil organization (Matt. xvi. 24).—The false men of the world think religion harmful. Nay, it is great gain But the enemy knows how to blind them (Rom. xiii. 1, *et seq.*)—LANGE'S *Opus:* A false, seducing doctrine and a corrupt spirit always go together, specially in perverted teachers. For as they are unenlightened, understanding and will are both evil (ver. 4).—CRAMER: The devil has no more direct way of doing injury to the Church, than to become a lying spirit in the mouth of the prophets (1 Kings xxii. 22). He begins with insolence; then come strife of words, hate, slander, envy, and one misfortune on another, so that an incurable injury is brought upon the Church of God (Ps. cxxxiii. 1).—STARKE: Whoever is godly, hath God; whoso hath God, hath all good.—Unhappy miser, restless with his heap, and never owning enough!—Nothing can more humble man, and help him to renounce the vanity of the world, than when he reflects aright on his entrance into, and his exit from the world (Job i. 21). We need food and covering for the body; God has promised both, if we do His will; yet He has not promised luxury. Let those who have that, be grateful, and all others contented (Gen. xxviii. 20).—OSIANDER: The avaricious man wants what he has, as well as what he has not.—Avarice is an evil mother, and has many hateful daughters.—Avarice can as little coexist with faith, as can any other ruling vices.—Avarice is fearful, not only because the Divine condemnation rests on it (1 Cor. v. 11; Eph. v. 5; Col. iii. 5), but because no vice so masters the soul, and keeps it from conversion.

HEUBNER: Pastors should not neglect to look specially after servants.—Meditation on death is a safeguard against avarice.—The Christian limitation of our wants.—Discontent is a source of discouragement.—Avarice is already a lapse from Christianity. The avaricious is his own tormentor.

LISCO (vers. 1, 2): How Christian liberty proves itself the true, by obedience (vers. 3, 10).—Godliness: (1.) In relation to false doctrines; (2.) to worldly goods.—The incompatibility of avarice with godliness.—The wealth of the godly spirit.—K. J. KLEMM: The great prize of the Christian.—GEROK: A contented spirit great gain: (1.) Shields us from the snares of the devil; (2.) teaches us to strive after heavenly wealth; (3.) gladdens the brief time of life; (4.) prepares us to die.—MAREZOLL: Encouragement and aid to contentment.—DIETZSCH: How incalculable a good is contentment in regard of our worldly possessions.

VON GERLACH (ver. 5): The gospel casts a wondrous light, to warm and illuminate man; but if it fail through his own sin, then that light thrown back from him flings its rays on the world, and dazzles him with deceitful images, till he loses at last the trace of truth, although he eagerly follows after its shadows. Sin remains undestroyed in his heart, and fleshly desires take advantage of the confusion. Such were the heretics of old, and such the Gnostics of all time.

[PASCAL, *Pensées*, i., p. 6: The discontent of man.—Our desires flatter us with the image of a happy condition, because they add to what we have, the pleasures we have not; but when we reach these, we are no happier, for we then have still new desires for a happiness beyond them.

Dr. SOUTH, Sermons: Godliness is gain. "To exhort men to be religious, is only, in other words, to exhort them to pleasure—a pleasure high, rational, and angelical, with no sting, no loathing, no remorses, or bitter farewells; neither liable to accident, nor exposed to injury. And when age itself shall begin to remind us of mortality, yet then the pleasure of the mind shall be in its full youth, vigor, and freshness. A palsy may as well shake an oak, or a fever dry up a fountain, as shake or impair the delight of conscience. For it lies within; it centres in the heart; it grows into the very substance of the soul, so that a man never outlives it; and for this cause, because he cannot outlive himself."—W.]

B.—Address to Timothy.—A word for the rich.—Conclusion of the Epistle.

CH. VI. 11–21.

11 But thou, O man of God,[1] flee these things; and follow after righteousness,
12 godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness. Fight the good fight of faith, lay
hold on [the] eternal life, whereunto thou art also[2] called [unto which thou wast
13 called], and hast professed a [the] good profession before many witnesses. I
give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth[3] all things, and *before*
Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a [the] good confession; [,]
14 That thou keep *this* commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appear-
15 ing of our Lord Jesus Christ [Christ Jesus]: [,] Which in his times he shall
shew, *who is* the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of
16 lords; [,] Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can
approach unto; [,] whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom *be* honor
17 and power everlasting. Amen.[4] Charge them that are rich in this world,[5] that
they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches [uncertainty of riches],
18 but in the living[6] God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; [,] That they
do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to commu-
19 nicate, Laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to
20 come, that they may lay hold on eternal [the true][7] life. O Timothy, keep that
which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane *and* vain babblings, and oppo-
21 sitions of science falsely so called [falsely named knowledge]: Which some pro-
fessing have erred concerning the faith. Grace *be* with thee. Amen.[8]

[1] Ver. 11.—[Lachmann omits the article before Θεοῦ; so also the Sinaiticus. In the same verse, πραϋπαθίαν is to be preferred to the common reading, πραότητα.—E. H.]

[2] Ver. 12.—καί after εἰς ἥν is omitted by the modern authorities; see Tischendorf. [Not in the Sinaiticus.—E. H.]

[3] Ver. 13.—[Tischendorf and Lachmann, after A. D. G., read ζωογονοῦντος. Sinaiticus has, like the *Recepta*, ζωοποιοῦντος. Etymologically, of course, the words differ, but there is not much difference in the sense in this place. —E. H.]

[4] Ver. 16.—[I suggest the following translation of vers. 15, 16: Which in his own times the blessed and sole sovereign, the King of kings and Lord of lords, who alone has immortality, (who) is dwelling in light inaccessible, whom no man (or, none amongst men) hath seen, or can see, shall shew. To whom be honor and power everlasting. Amen. —E. H.]

[5] Ver. 17.—Instead of the usual ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι, the Sinaiticus has καιρῷ.

[6] Ver. 17.—This adjective is wanting in A. G., and others, and is omitted by Tischendorf. In D., and in the Sinaiticus, the article is wanting. [The Sinaiticus has ἐπί θεῷ; Lachmann, ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ. Tischendorf retains ἐν. —E. H.]

[7] Ver. 19.—Instead of αἰωνίου, we should read, with A. D.[1] E. F. G., the Sinaiticus, and others, ὄντως. So Griesbach, in this place.

[8] Ver. 21.—Probably spurious.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 11. **But thou, O man of God,** &c. The Apostle turns suddenly again to Timothy, as if he had entered almost too far into general topics, and wished henceforth to keep his young disciple wholly in view to the close of the Epistle. There is an emphasis in the tone with which he addresses him, as not only his spiritual son, but the man of God, the servant of the Lord. *O man of God*, is equivalent to the Hebrew אִישׁ אֱלֹהִים. This name places Timothy, as a Christian prophet, by the side of the chosen messengers of the Divine will in the Old Testament (comp. 2 Peter i. 21).—**Flee these things,** ταῦτα; that is, the φιλαργυρία, already spoken of, and again in ver. 17, where St. Paul mentions the true use of earthly riches.—**Follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness** (comp. 2 Tim. ii. 22). According to Rom. xii. 21, evil must be overcome by good; and thus St. Paul sets against the opposite vices a series of Christian virtues and affections. *Righteousness* is not here to be taken *sensu forensi*, but *sensu morali*, as uprightness, or integrity. *Godliness*, or, more specially, the direction of the inward life toward God (comp. Titus ii. 12). *Faith, love*, the two primal virtues of Christianity, are to be here understood in the usual Pauline sense. *Patience*, finally, concerns all which could disturb the soul; and *meekness* (πραϋπάθειαν, after the more probable reading; see Tischendorf), refers to all which might embitter the heart. So long as Timothy grew into this moral character, he ran no danger of infection from the shameless avarice of the heretical teachers. [These virtues seem grouped in pairs; δικαιοσύνη and εὐσέβεια, touching general obedience to God's law; πίστις and ἀγάπη, the inner springs of Christian character; ὑπομ. and πραϋπ., our spirit toward the enemies of the truth; see Huther, *in loco*.—W.]

Ver. 12. **Fight the good fight of faith** (comp. 1 Cor. iv. 24; Phil. iii. 12; 1 Tim. i. 18; 2 Tim. iv. 7). A repetition of the favorite image by which St. Paul is wont to describe the Christian life, and especially that of the minister of the Lord. Here, too, Timothy is not addressed merely as a

man or as an Evangelist, but in both relations. This fight is called good, not only in regard of its moral excellence, but as a lofty and noble one.—*Fight of faith;* not strictly because it is on behalf of the faith (Mack and Heydenreich), but rather because it is born of the faith, is proper to the faith, and has its power only from the faith. The same figurative style is continued in what follows.—**Lay hold on eternal life;** as the βραβεῖον, for which the athlete strives, and which he grasps at the end of his course. —**Whereunto thou art called.** This, according to Heydenreich, should also be considered a figurative expression, alluding to the herald who solemnly summons the athletes to the contest. But this is less probable, since such a summons, though required, indeed, for the strife, was not so for the prize. We therefore understand ἐκλήϑ. here in the ordinary sense of that outward and inward calling which gave success to the confessor of the gospel. This remembrance would awaken Timothy to his duty to press toward the mark; it would strengthen him in the assurance that, if he strove, his calling was the pledge of eternal life.—**And hast professed the good profession.** A fresh motive for Timothy in the fight of faith. Thou hast professed, should rather (De Wette, and others) be considered a new, independent proposition, than, as many do, to make ὁμολόγησας dependent on the preceding εἰς ἥν, which gives a hard construction and a scarcely intelligible sense. The good profession which Timothy had made is not clearly defined by Paul. Some think it the confession made at baptism; others, that given at his induction into the ministry; others, a Christian testimony, given by him during some public persecution or some severe conflict. But the youth of Timothy makes the last view improbable; and as his testimony (ver. 13) is compared in some degree with that of the Lord, who had borne witness before Pilate in words as well as deeds, we may best refer this to one of the two occasions already named. The *many* witnesses, who surely were present at his ordination rather than his baptism, lead us to conclude that the Apostle alludes to the same event, named in chap. iv. 14 and 2 Tim. i. 6. [This view of the text is maintained by NEANDER, "Planting and Training of the Church," vol. ii.; also by Ellicott, and others, *in loco*. It is worth noting, however, that the authentic traditions of the Church point back to the custom of such a "confession of faith" at baptism. "*Mos ibi servatur antiquus, eos qui gratiam baptismi suscepturi sunt publice, id est, fidelium populo audiente symbolum reddere;*" RUFFINUS, *De Symb.* 3. We do not suppose that the later baptismal office existed in the apostolic day; but it is not at all improbable that the germ of such a usage began at that time.—W.]

Ver. 13. **I give thee charge . . . confession.** The allusion to Timothy's confession leads the Apostle now to speak of the Saviour Himself, whose remembrance must awaken a new motive for fidelity and zeal.—*I charge thee* (comp. chap. i. 3); a form of solemn adjuration well fitted to the grandeur of the subject.—**In the sight of God, who quickeneth all things.** "An encouraging remembrance of the resurrection, and thus indirectly a motive against the fear of death in the cause of Jesus, to which the following clause also alludes;" De Wette. —**And before Jesus Christ, who before Pontius Pilate.** Ἐπὶ does not signify *under* Pontius Pilate (De Wette; so Bengel, *periocha temporis notissima*), but, as Matt. xxviii. 14, and elsewhere, *coram*. The recollection that the Lord had lived and suffered in the days of Pontius Pilate, was quite superfluous; but the statement that His confession was made *coram procuratore*, clearly shows to what witness the Apostle refers. It can only be that narrated in John xviii. 36 and Matt. xxvii. 11; and this was indeed worthy to be held up to Timothy, as the pattern of a true confessor of the truth in face of death. Μαρτυρεῖν means here the same as ὁμολογεῖν in the verse before; and we may thus, when we recall this passage, justly regard Christ as the first Martyr of the New Covenant.

[There is somewhat striking in the identity of these words of Paul with the clause of the Apostle's Creed, "suffered under Pontius Pilate." It does not seem to us a mere verbal fancy, if we regard it, when coupled with the καλὴ ὁμολογία made by Timothy, as giving a hint in regard to the formation of that first and simplest *symbolum* of the faith. We reject, of course, the old, mechanical tradition, that this creed was made by the Apostles, or existed in its present written form before a later age. But the various fragments of such a received "form of words," as we find them in JUSTIN MART., *Apol.*, i. 13, *Dial.*, 85; IRENÆUS, *Hæres.*, 1, 2, and TERTULLIAN; all agreeing in the ideas and general structure, while differing in detail, point clearly to some original "confession of faith," probably oral; and although without sure date or authorship, yet running back so far toward apostolic time as to have been naturally ascribed to it. Thus this phrase, "under Pontius Pilate," as cited by St. Paul, may have become incorporated with the earliest germinal creed. We have here what seems the structural law of growth in the church: first the age of organic, yet undeveloped life, then of scientific formation in doctrine and worship.—W.]

Ver. 14. **That thou keep,** &c. St. Paul now sets forth the matter, which he has introduced to Timothy with so solemn a charge. Τηρῆσαί σε τὴν ἐντολήν. It is not likely, after so lofty an adjuration, that he meant merely his exhortation to flee from avarice (ver. 11), and like sins. We look rather at his encouragement to the good fight of the Christian life, and the bold confession of the Lord (ver. 12, *et seq.*). We may say that in this, as the chief commandment, all is embraced which could be asked of Timothy. The view of many, that we must regard this word, **commandment,** as the παραγγελία of the Christian moral law in general (chap. i. 5), seems too far-fetched, and quite needless.—**Without spot, unrebukable;** not to be referred to σε, but to ἐντολήν. "Paul exhorts Timothy so to keep the law, that it may not be stained and open to reproach, as with the false teachers;" Huther.—**Until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ.** The final παρουσία of the Lord, at the judgment of the world, which in the apostolic age was expected as nigh at hand. Bengel justly says: "*Fideles in praxi suâ proponebant sibi diem Christi ut appropinquentem; nos solemus nobis horam mortis proponere.*" We must, however, add that the Christian life of many has gained nothing by the change.

[It is to take nothing from the essential authority of the apostolic writings, if we grant their belief in a speedy advent of Christ. Indeed, our Lord declared that they had no revelation of the times (Acts i. 7). The prophecy was, in its nature, a dim one, only to be interpreted by history; and it was natural that to them the lofty truth should be a present reality. It is thus by degrees the crude millennial theo-

ries of a Papias have faded away, because through eighteen centuries the Church has seen always a new, further horizon rise before it, and can more soberly read the historic plan of Christianity. Yet the kingdom of God should be to our mature faith a nobler reality than if we believed it literally at hand. See, in NEANDER's "Planting and Training," some admirable remarks on the spiritual character of St. John's doctrine of the *παρουσία*.—W.]

Ver. 15. **Which in his times**, &c., *ἣν καιροῖς ἰδίοις δείξει, κ.τ.λ.*; a peculiar expression, unlike the usual style of St. Paul, yet clear in its meaning. God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, will show, set forth, bring to pass, the glorious revelation of His Son (*δεικνύναι*). Christ is unseen for a while; the time of His manifestation in full glory (*ἐπιφάνεια*) rests in the counsels of God, who has appointed the exact moment.—*In his times* (comp. Titus i. 3; Gal. iv. 4).—**The blessed and only Potentate.** This mention of God, as One through whom the Epiphany of Christ is to be made known, calls forth from the Apostle a psalm of thanksgiving, in which he expresses those attributes of the Almighty which confirm this Christian hope, and which are contrasted with the desires of man after the transient goods of this world. *Blessed*, signifies one who has in Himself alone the sources of the highest joy; the *only Potentate*, the one only who has and exercises power. Perhaps *μόνος* is indirectly contrasted with the Gnostic notion of the many Æons—a notion which existed in its germ already in the Pauline age. —**The King of kings and Lord of lords**; not only in a spiritual, but a cosmical sense.

[We cannot but think that this passage, taken in connection with the whole sketch of these errorists, refers emphatically to a Jewish doctrine of Æons. It may be clearly traced to the mystics of the Essene type. They held a hierarchy of Powers, emanations from the First Principle, and presiding over certain cosmical spheres. It was the germ of the Sephiroths of the Kabbala, and the Æons of the Gnosis. See EWALD, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, B. 4, p. 208. This was the esoteric science, kept for the *illuminati*, while the people held only the Jewish angelology in its exoteric, fanciful form. Such floating seeds of error may easily have fallen into the Jewish-Christian soil of the Church. See, for a clear view of this earlier Jewish Gnosticism, REUSS, *Theol. Chret.*, vol. 1, p. 371, *et seq.*—W.]

Ver. 16. **Who only hath immortality.** The Apostle continues to praise the excellencies of God; and here he specially sets forth that completeness, whereby in His eternal Being He is lifted above all changing things. "*Ac si dixisset Paulus, solum Deum non a seipso tantum esse immortalem et suapte natura, sed immortalitatem in potestate habere, ut in creaturas non competat, nisi quatenus suam illis virtutem inspirans eas vegetat;*" Calvin.—**Dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto.** Possessor of the light, as He is possessor of the life. Like descriptions are found in Ps. civ. 2. God is clothed with light, as a garment, 1 John i. 5. God is light, &c.—**Whom no man hath seen, nor can see.** A description of the invisible nature of God, which includes also the idea that He is incomprehensible (comp. John i. 18; 1 John iv. 12; Col. i. 15; Heb. xi. 27; Rom. xi. 33–36).—**To whom be honor and power everlasting**; *i. e.*, to whom they properly belong. Some suppose that we have here, as chap. iii. 16, the fragment of an ancient church-hymn.

Ver. 17. **Charge them that are rich in this world.** The Apostle might have fitly closed the Epistle with this doxology. But he once more turns back to the topic, which had been interrupted by his digression (vers. 11–16). He had named the dangers of those who would be rich; he now addresses those who are rich in worldly goods. But he at once shows the merely relative worth of their wealth, in calling it of "this world." He does not, however, speak of the rich as having their part exclusively in this world (Luke xvi. 25); rather, he encourages them to Christian godliness, because their wealth, though in itself temporal, may, by a wise and reasonable use, be raised to somewhat higher. Timothy must, therefore, warn them of their peril, and charge them **not to be high-minded**—a peculiar vice of rich men (Jer. ix. 24; Ps. lxii. 9). Pride may be found without wealth; but it is hard to have wealth without pride.—**Nor trust in uncertain riches.** The Apostle, in speaking not only of uncertain riches, but *in substant.* of the uncertainty of all riches, beautifully conveys the thought that he who trusts in them rests on that which is itself *ἀδηλότης*, and so is in worst peril.—**But in the living God, who giveth us richly**, &c. *Ἐν ζῶντι* is critically untenable, many of the comments here are useless; yet those of Melanchthon and Calvin deserve notice. Instead of trusting in wealth, the rich should trust in the Giver, who wills that we should enjoy His rich gifts. *Εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν*, not strictly contrasted with asceticism, but with excessive desire for earthly things. "To enjoy, not to rest our hearts on;" Wiesinger.

Ver. 18. **That they do good . . . communicate.** The Apostle does not merely warn the rich against error, but sets before them the right way which will gain the enjoyment God allows. To do good, is a general conception, like *ἀγαθοποιεῖν* (Acts xiv. 17); promoting the happiness of others. —**Rich in good works**; meaning not Christian beneficence merely, but good action in general. The two next words are specific: **ready to distribute, willing to communicate** (comp. Luke iii. 11; Eph. iv. 28). If there be any distinction here, the former may mean the generous hand, the latter the sympathetic heart; both conceptions, however, are connected, and neither of worth without the other.

Ver. 19. **Laying up in store**, &c., *ἀποθησαυρίζοντας ἑαυτοῖς*. St. Paul makes clear, that through such works of love we promote our own eternal interests. Our action toward others is a treasure for ourselves (comp. Matt. vi. 21). It is obvious that spiritual treasures are meant, as a good **foundation against the time to come**, *θεμέλιον καλὸν εἰς τὸ μέλλον*. This view of a treasure as *θεμέλιον* is not strange in such a concise style as the Apostle here uses, evidently hastening to the close, and critical conjectures are thus superfluous. The conception is at bottom the same with that of our Lord (Luke xvi. 9).—**That they may lay hold on the true life.** *Ὄντως* instead of *αἰωνίου* (see textual note above). *Ἵνα τελικῶς*, not *ἐκβατικῶς*, is here to be understood. The attainment of a true life is thus the highest end, which the rich must seek by the wise and worthy use of his wealth. Thus he reaches the *βραβεῖον*, which St. Paul set before Timothy. Bengel very finely says: "*Mercator, naufragis salvus, thesauros domum præmissos invenit.*" [This strong expression of St. Paul seems at first glance hardly Pauline. It must not be abused into any notion of a deposit of meritorious

works, as it has been by some Roman expositors. In the deepest sense, eternal life is a gift, and its only θεμέλιον the grace of God. To be charitable for the sake of gaining heaven by it, is absurdity, for the selfish motive vitiates the act. It is the same fallacy which in former days so often led the rich noble, after a life of bloodshed, to wipe out his sins by building a church. But St. Paul alike denies that empty faith which has no fruit in real charity. The love that is "rich in good works," grows within as it gives away; and that wealth of the heart a Christian man shall "carry with him when he dieth," for it is of the very being of the soul.—W.]

Ver. 20. **O Timothy, keep that,** &c. Once more the Apostle sums the whole Epistle in one heartfelt, closing injunction. O Timothy, he says out of the fulness of his fatherly heart, **keep that committed to thy trust,** τὴν παρακαταθήκην φύλαξον (comp. 2 Tim. i. 12). As there is no exact statement here, there is room for many conjectures, and there have been enough, older and newer. It seems obvious, from the occurrence of παρακαταθήκη at the close, that something general and of high value is meant; it may be the sound doctrine, it may be the ministerial office, or both together. The former view seems preferable, since φύλασσειν is better referred to the treasure of the word, than of the διακονία; and yet more there seems to be, in what directly follows, an antithesis between sound doctrine and error. Παραθήκη as well as παρακαταθήκη in the Greek signifies the deposit of anything with a person, who holds himself bound to return it uninjured; and hence the word is applied to the thing, the *depositum* itself.—**Avoiding,** &c.; denoting the way in which Timothy should keep this trust.—**Profane and vain babblings** (comp. 2 Tim. ii. 16). Nothing is here meant beyond the ματαιολογία and λογομαχία, whose worthlessness St. Paul has already shown; the error of the heretical teachers, here anew branded as at bottom empty negation. He adds a yet farther feature: **oppositions of science falsely so called;** i. e., unworthy of so good a name. The errors are called ἀντιθέσεις, not only because they were utterly opposed in themselves to pure gospel doctrine, but brought forward in a direct polemic way against it. For other explanations, see De Wette. Conybeare and Howson well say *in loco:* "The most natural interpretation (considering the junction with κενοφωνίας and the λογομαχίας ascribed to the heretics above, ver. 4) is to suppose that St. Paul here speaks not of the doctrines, but of the dialectical and rhetorical arts of the false teachers." These antitheses were the fruit of the falsely so-called science. It is acknowledged that the errorists already in that time boasted of a higher knowledge in the mysteries (Col. ii. 8). But St. Paul, at the close, explains how this γνῶσις was the direct enemy of the πίστις, the principle of faith in the truth.

[This expression at the close deserves far more study than most expositors give it. It clearly shows that these false theories not only existed in a sporadic way, but had already assumed the defined form, and even the name of a Gnosis. No explanation of the ἀντιθέσεις is satisfactory, from our almost entire ignorance of the methods of that early school. Perhaps some earlier Marcion had brought forward his views in the shape of an antilogy to the received teaching. But, in any case, St. Paul recognized the distinct chasm between a Christian truth and a false science. The one was a theosophy, the other a living spiritual fact. The one turned Christianity into a Rabbinical school, with its doctrine of divine emanations and the dualism of an evil material principle; the other taught the plain revelation of God in the incarnate Son. The one held the union of the soul with the divine by a rigid asceticism, or a spiritual ecstasy; the other knit Christian growth with the ties of household and social life. The one gave an esoteric knowledge for the few initiated; the other a religion of duty for all men. We cannot read this Epistle, and that to the Colossians, without clearly seeing the seed-vessels of all, which ripened in Marcion and Valentinus.—W.]

Ver. 21. **Which some professing,** &c. The worst peril of a Christian man is surely in losing the straight road of the gospel and straying into the byway. It had been so with many so-called wise, whose hapless end should be a warning to Timothy. *Which some professing,* ἥν τινες ἐπαγγελλόμενοι; *quam nonnulli profitentes,* quite as in chap. ii. 10. They professedly sought salvation in their knowledge, and in this very way **have erred concerning the faith,** ἠστόχησαν (comp. 2 Tim. ii. 18). Bengel: "*Veram sagacitatem, quæ fidei est, amiserunt, non capientes quid sit credendum et quid sit credere*" (comp. 2 Tim. iii. 7, 8).—**Grace be with thee. Amen.** Μετὰ σοῦ; according to A. F. G., ὑμῶν should be read, in which case the church would be included, so far as it had any knowledge of the Epistle. As, however, it is addressed specially to Timothy, no more salutations are added. In the Second Epistle it is otherwise, since it was, in a measure, the farewell of the Apostle to the church, and to life.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The illustration, drawn from the ancient athletic contests, sketches most strikingly the character, the calling, the dangers, and high hopes of the Christian life. It is not strange that it has been a favorite figure of believers in all times, as well as of Paul. But it sets before us likewise the object of the minister of the gospel, who is called to be a witness of the Lord. His life is a combat, but a combat which assures him, if he be faithful to the end, of the heavenly crown.

2. The remembrance of the solemn profession made by the Christian on entering the church, must indeed inspire in him a true and steadfast zeal. We also, as well as Timothy, have, in our union with Christ and His Body, confessed before many witnesses—ministry, teachers, friends, the whole visible and invisible Church—nay, before the Lord and His angels. This confession is, then, more than an outward show; it is to be confirmed by our life. Next to the thought of the Lord's coming (Matt. x. 32, 33), this of our good confession has the strongest influence on our fidelity. (Compare the view of the nature and importance of confirmation, by NITZSCH, "Pract. Theol.," vol. ii., p. 436).

3. Shallow and unsatisfying as the rationalistic view is of our Lord's suffering and death, as only the confirmation of His teaching and the bestowal of a high example, yet it would be as one-sided if we forget that He was the first, noblest witness of the truth. It is to be noted, that martyrs and witnesses (μάρτυρες) are the same word.

4. The doctrine of the invisible being of God,

rightly understood, is a needful safeguard against all anthropomorphism and anthropopathism (comp. Ex. xxxiii. 18, 23). Whatever in this truth of the unseen Jehovah was hard for Israel, is done away for us Christians, who have seen the Father in the Son (comp. John i. 18; xiv. 9).

5. The name here ascribed to God—King of kings and Lord of lords—is the same given (Rev. xvii. 14; xix. 16) to the glorified Saviour; a clear proof of the divinity of the Son.

6. Christianity does not forbid the use of riches, and assigns no other limits to the lawful enjoyments of life than what reason and conscience approve. But it warns the rich of his special perils, and strives to make earthly wealth the means of growth in the heavenly. The story of the rich young man (Matt. xix. 16–21) is a weighty illustration of St. Paul's precept.

7. The relation of πίστις to γνῶσις has been always an essential question. The *credo quia absurdum* and the *quæro intelligere, ut credam*, are alike one-sided. The true position is given in the *credo, ut intelligam*. Man must rise through faith to knowledge, and again pass through knowledge to a growing faith. The true connection is nobly pointed out by St. John (1 John v. 13): "These things have I written unto you that believe in the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe in the name of the Son of God." Irrational as it is to scorn knowledge in the name of faith, it is as fruitless to recognize nothing as the object of πίστις, which has not been first reached by γνῶσις. The *credo, quamquam absurdum*, finally, is truer than the *non credo, quia absurdum*. The γνῶσις may develop the truths of faith, but can in no way take the place of faith.

[St. Augustin: Reason should not submit, unless it decides for itself that there are occasions when it ought to submit. Its very submission is then reasonable.

Pascal, *Penseés:* Nothing is so rational, as the disavowal of reason in what is of faith. And nothing is so contrary to reason, as the disavowal of reason in what is not of faith. Both extremes are alike dangerous: the exclusion of reason, and the admission of reason alone.—W.]

9. "*Nullusne ergo in Ecclesia Christi profectus habebitur religionis? Habeatur plane et maximus, sed ita tamen ut vere profectus sit ille fidei, non permutatio. Siquidem ad profectionem pertinet, ut in semet ipsa una quæque res amplificetur, ad permutationem vero, ut aliquid ex alio in aliud transvertatur. Crescat igitur oportet, et multum vehementerque proficiat tam singulorum quam omnium, tam unius hominis quam totius Ecclesiæ ætatum ac sæculorum gradibus intelligentia, scientia, sapientia, sed in suo dumtaxat genere, in eodem scilicet dogmati, eodem sensu eademque sententia. Imitetur animarum religio rationem corporum, quæ licet annorum processu numeros suos evolvant et explicant, eadem tamen quæ erant, permanent;*" Vincent. Lirin., *Commonitorium*, chap. xxviii.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The minister of the gospel a man of God: (1.) His inferiority to, (2.) his equality with, (3.) his rank above the prophets of the Old Covenant.—Not enough to escape error; we must also excel in godliness.—Ver. 12 (specially fitted for confirmation): The combat of the Christian life: (1.) The life of the Christian a fight; (2.) a good fight; (3.) a fight of faith; (4.) a fight whose prize is life eternal; (5.) a fight inspired by the remembrance of our good confession.—Jesus before Pilate, the archetype of a confessor of the truth.—How the thought of the Lord's advent should fill us with steadfastness.—Although the time of Christ's coming be wisely hid from us, yet it is exactly fixed in the counsels of God.—God, who only hath immortality: (1.) The sublimity; (2.) the comfort of this truth.—Dangers, duties, blessings of wealth.—The illusion of worldly, and the sure hope of heavenly riches.—How may wealth be a hindrance, how a help to eternal life?—The wealth of God: (1.) He gives all things; (2.) He gives richly; (3.) He gives for us to enjoy.—The unity of faith and knowledge in Christianity.—The true and false illumination.—Christian faith also true wisdom (comp. Luke x. 21).

Starke: Anton: There is much to endure in the office of the Christian teacher, but eternity lies beyond. If we look thither, we shall not weary of the combat (1 Peter v. 4; 2 Cor. iv. 14, 16).—Hedinger: Knowing and professing [*Erkennen u. bekennen*] should not be separated (Rom. x. 9.).—Anton: There is no higher comfort than in looking to Christ. Nothing can befall us in the work of the ministry which has not a response from Christ (Heb. xii. 2).—It is a well-tried Christian habit, to strengthen ourselves through the sufferings of Christ.—As God is King of kings and Lord of lords, we must never obey the kings and lords of this world when they claim what is against God's law (Acts v. 29).—Cramer: God hath still as much to give as He hath given. The earth is His, and all that therein is (Ps. xxiv. 1).—Starke: God gives many wealth, that He may try partly their gratitude to Him, partly their kindness to the needy (Ex. xvi. 4).—He who helps the poor, gives God his money on interest, and gains more than he lays out (Prov. xix. 17).—The gospel is a wealth entrusted us by God; therefore must we care, like all who hold trust funds, not to lose this treasure (Rev. iii. 10, 11).—Osiander: The highest science is, to know, to simply believe, and freely obey God's word (Luke viii. 15).

Heubner: The remembrance of past battles strengthens for the new.—We should never fall behind ourselves.—The sottishness of the proud is trust in wealth.—Good works are a heavenly capital, yielding an overflowing profit.—The notes of the true knowledge (see James iii. 17).

Von Gerlach: "Whoso builds on the changeable, must needs be lost; whoso builds on the immortal, changeless God, lives in His life, His wealth, and shall share His eternity."

Lisco: The Christian life (1.) strives after perfection (ver. 11); (2.) fights against sin (ver. 12); (4.) endures till the life of glory (vers. 13, 14).—Counsel: (1.) for the worldly rich; (2.) the mentally rich, who overvalue knowledge.—Nitzsch (vers. 12, 15): How right and needful that we make a good confession to the best of Confessors (Sermon V., p. 138).—Beck: The high calling of the man of God: (1.) To what; (2.) for what.—Fischer: The characteristics of the Christian life.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO

TIMOTHY.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. TIME, PLACE, AND PURPOSE OF COMPOSITION.

THE second letter to Timothy was written by Paul from Rome, after he was imprisoned the second time, and saw his martyrdom at hand. It plainly shows that the condition of the Apostle is wholly changed since the sending of the first letter; and this, together with his clear view of his approaching end, gives to this writing a wholly unique character; so that it has been not without reason called the testament of the dying Paul to his spiritual son, and to the whole community. The hope with which the Apostle had sent his first letter, viz., that he should soon return to Ephesus (1 Tim. iii. 14), was not to be fulfilled; he was now in bonds (see 2 Tim. i. 8, 16). That it is impossible here to think of his first imprisonment, appears directly from this, that Mark is not present (chap. iv. 11), who was with him, however, during the first imprisonment (Col. iv. 10), as well as Timothy himself (Phil. i. 1). At present, then, the Apostle no longer has the expectation, as before, of being released. On the contrary, though for the moment he is freed from the rage of the lions (2 Tim. iv. 17), yet he is strongly convinced that the time of his departure is at hand (chap. iv. 6). The year of Paul's death, as is acknowledged, is variously given by the biblical chronologies of all times. The opinion of Wiessler (*Chronol. des apostolischen Zeitalters*), that he died in the year 64, agrees with his denial of the second imprisonment, and, hence, he places the death of the Apostle somewhat too early. Eichhorn, with greater truth, considers his death to have been between 65 and 68. After a mature reckoning of all the reasons, the last-named year is, however, in our view, hardly probable; and we may accordingly name the year 67 as the *ultimus terminus ad quem*. At the beginning of this, or toward the close of the previous year, this letter to Timothy must, then, have been sent from Rome. A closer reckoning is superfluous for our purpose, since the difference of a few months has no decisive influence either on the explanation of the language or the view of the facts. The view of Baronius already expressed, and accepted in passing by Bengel, that June 29 of the year 67 was the true day of the Apostle's death, has no other origin than a tradition, worthy of little confidence.

At this time Timothy was at his post at Ephesus, where the First Epistle likewise had reached him, whilst the condition of the community still caused the Apostle just anxiety. His letter, which fully bears the character of a private communication, is designed to encourage Timothy, to acquaint him with the condition of the Apostle, and urge him, as

soon as possible, to come and bring Mark with him (chap. iv. 9, 11, 21). The tone of the whole letter is, if possible, still more natural and affectionate than the first to Timothy; and, while in that the holy indignation of the Apostle against the errorists of the church is more apparent, there speaks in this rather the tender grief of a departing father. The mention of a great number of individual persons and names, which appear here, is an internal evidence of genuineness; and, among the pastoral counsels, there occur many expressions of surpassing worth for the doctrine as well as for the apologetics of Christianity (chap. ii. 8-13; chap. iii. 15-17; chap. iv. 7, 8, and others).

§ 2. ITS CONTENTS AND DIVISION.

After the usual introduction, together with the apostolic greeting, Paul thankfully calls God to witness, how unceasingly he thinks of Timothy, and heartily desires to see him, who had received so early the unstained faith of his grandmother and mother (chap. i. 3, 6). The admonition, added to this, touches first on the holy gifts (chap. i. 6-18) which he had received though the laying on of hands. Timothy must stir up these gifts in himself (vers. 6, 7), and rightly employ them (ver. 8) through patient suffering (vers. 9-12), and through true adherence to the doctrine, which he had heard from Paul (vers. 13, 14). After a short sketch of the personal experiences of the Apostle (vers. 15-18), there follows a second admonition (chap. ii. 1-13) to suffer boldly what is appointed him for the cause of the Lord. He must be a true soldier of Jesus Christ, a zealous workman in His great field, remembering the resurrection of Christ, and in view of the example of Paul, confiding in the truth of the Lord. But soon the tone of the admonition begins to grow more polemic, directed against the errorists, whose word and example might mislead Timothy to walk in an opposite path. The third great division of the Epistle (chap. ii. 14-26) contains advice, which concerns closely the conduct of Timothy toward these false leaders. He must avoid all strife of words (ver. 14), rightly divide the word of God (ver. 15), and, as far as possible, shun idle babblings (vers. 16-21); he must flee also youthful lusts, and not only seek to overcome his opponents, but also shame them, and strive to improve them through mild and friendly action (vers. 23-26).

The Apostle now passes to the fourth principal division, in which he encourages Timothy to bold fidelity in view of the approaching apostasy of the last times (chap. iii. 1-5). He describes the immoral character and the wicked strivings of those, who should soon be made manifest even to that debased generation (chap. iii. 1-9); and sets before him the example of patience, which Timothy had seen in him (vers. 10-13); and at the same time the task, which he would have to follow (vers. 14-17); in which light he points him specially to the inspired Scripture, as the best defence against the overwhelming falsehood. Then, in the most solemn tone, the Apostle sums up with a few words the warning in regard to what lies before him, as well as the remembrance of what he has to do (chap. iv. 1-5).

Now the Epistle hastens to its close (chap. iv. 6-21). Paul prophesies his approaching martyrdom, and records his joyful hope of eternity (vers. 6-8). He adds the prayer, that Timothy will come to him as soon as possible, since otherwise he may never perhaps see him again in the land of the living. This invitation is yet more strengthened by a brief account of the Apostle's forsaken state (vers. 10-12), which is only relieved by Luke; wherefore he earnestly wishes to see Mark also by his side. Timothy is asked on this occasion to bring with him some necessary things for the Apostle (ver. 13). Paul speaks further, before he reaches the close, of a severe opposition which he had experienced (vers. 14, 15); but also of a mighty aid, when forsaken of all, by which he is strengthened in the hope, that the hour will soon come of his complete deliverance, if not from death, yet through death (ver. 16-18). Holy greetings and benedictions, as well as some personal topics, close the letter, which especially in this last part, bears so wholly undeniable a stamp of genuineness and reality, that we cannot enough wonder at the desperate attempts to hunt up another author than Paul. (Compare the General Introduction.)

Without any extended argument, the lasting authority of this second Epistle for the martyrdom of Paul is self-evident. It is a treasure for the Christian church of all ages, a noble crown of his earlier testimonies. "*Mortem habebat Paulus ante oculos, quam subire paratus erat pro Evangelii testimonio. Quæcumque igitur hic legimus de Christi regno, de spe vitæ æternæ, de christianâ militiâ, de fiduciâ confessionis, de certitudine doctrinæ, non tanquam atramento scripta, sed ipsius Pauli sanguine accipere convenit; nihil enim asserit, pro quo mortis suæ pignus non opponat. Proinde hæc Epistola quasi solemnis quædam est subscriptio Paulinæ doctrinæ, eaque ex re præsenti;*" Calvin.

§ 3. LITERATURE.

Besides the writers already named in the first General Introduction, we may compare J. Brückner, *Commentt. de Epist. posteriori Pauli ad Timoth.*, Copenh., 1829; *Programma ad locum apostolicum*, 2 Tim. ii. 8–13, Tüb. 1820. See further, on the Apostle's second imprisonment, in reference to the genuineness of the Epistle, the remarks of Wiesinger, in his commentary on this passage, p. 581 *et seq.* Finally, in reference to the Pastoral Letters as a whole, Dr. C. E. Scharling, "Latest Inquiries as to the so-called Pastoral Epistles of the New Testament, translated from the Danish," Jena, 1846.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO

TIMOTHY.

I.

Superscription and Salutation.

CH. I. 1, 2.

1 Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, according to the
2 promise[1] of life which is in Christ Jesus, To Timothy *my* dearly beloved Son:
Grace, mercy, *and* peace, from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ.

[1] Ver. 1.—[Cod. Sin. has ἐπαγγελίας.—E. H.]
[2] Ver. 2.—[The *Recepta*, and all modern critical editions, have a fullpoint after τέκνῳ.—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **By the will of God,** διὰ θελήματος. In the First Epistle the phrase is, "by the commandment of God." The ἐπιταγή is the fruit of the θέλημα, and the choice of this latter word in this place is to be explained perhaps thus: The Apostle, in view of his approaching end, in Christian resignation, felt the need of directing his attention to His will, who, according to His own eternal counsels, had led him along this pathway (comp. Gal. i. 15, 16). Psychologically, also, it is worthy of remark, how, in the opening of this last communication, in the very face of death, he places in the foreground *the promise of life* in Christ Jesus.—**According to the promise of life,** &c., κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν ζωῆς. We believe that in this way we can best render the sense of this enigmatical κατά. It is known how these words have been variously explained in all periods. Luther has, *according to the promise;* De Wette, *for* the promise (or promising) of life, which by itself, without farther comment, is scarcely intelligible; others, still, interpret otherwise. In any event, something in the way of thought must be supplied. Certainly, they who maintain that ἐπαγγελία here cannot mean *proclamation*, but *promise* only, are in the right. Yet κατά expresses necessarily *the object* of the apostolical function of Paul. Paul can be named, however, an Apostle for the promise of life, only from the consideration that he is called, through the will of God, to the office of proclaiming this promise (comp. WINER, *Gramm.*, p. 358).—*Promise of life* is that promise the main substance of which is the true, eternal, and blessed life. What kind of life the Apostle here denotes, he states more particularly by the words, τῆς ἐν Χριστ. Ἰησοῦ. Since, indeed, this life is revealed and manifested personally in the Saviour, while in His fellowship it becomes the inheritance of all believers, so likewise is He the grand centre forth from which it streams without ceasing. It was the apostolic calling of Paul to set forth this life constantly; and just herein lies the power of proclaiming the gospel—its main substance being a promise of life, as the sinner needs it, and which he seeks in vain apart from Christ.

Ver. 2. **Dearly beloved son,** ἀγαπητῷ τέκνῳ. Certainly it is arbitrary to wish to find in the Apostle's use of this adjective, instead of γνησίῳ (1 Tim. i. 2), a proof that Timothy no longer deserved that honorable epithet, on account of an open defect in the temper of his faith (Mack). Ver. 5 establishes the contrary. The reason why this word ἀγαπητῷ is here used, in our judgment admits of a very simple explanation. The Apostle, feeling that he must soon be separated, speaks in a more affectionate tone than before, and it is better suited to the wholly more subjective character of this second Epistle; which view is incorrectly questioned by Huther. It was not so much in the mind of the Apostle to bear

honorable witness to Timothy, as to express the inwardness of the relation in which both stood to each other.—**Grace, mercy,** &c. See remarks upon 1 Tim. i. 2.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. By describing the gospel as a promise of the life which is in Christ Jesus, the characteristic distinction between it and the law is strikingly brought out, and its high, all-surpassing worth at the same time is shown.

2. The gospel is no abstract system of doctrine by the side of or even higher than other systems, but it is a revelation of the life which is manifest in Christ, and which through Christ is conveyed to the sinner. In this particular Paul and John agree (comp. 1 John i. 2). The high scope of the manifestation of Christ was not that He might communicate to the spirit of man even a new wealth in religious ideas, but that he might give to the heart of the sinner, lying in spiritual death, the treasure of a new life (Eph. ii. 1). But such a communication of life to the sinner, through Christ, is something inconceivable as long as one hesitates to acknowledge the true Godhead of the Lord (comp. John i. 1–4).

3. The tranquillity with which Paul—as we behold him not only in this opening of, but throughout the entire Epistle—contemplated death, is not only convincing proof of his true greatness, but it has also apologetic value. The tone of the Apostle furnishes proof alike of the glory of the gospel, and the mighty working of the power of God in His feeble servants.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Paul prepared to write the testament of love for his spiritual son and brother.—Paul remains true to his holy calling even unto death (comp. Matt. xxiv. 13; Rev. ii. 10).—The unwavering certainty of the Apostle in respect of his call to apostleship: (1.) Its foundation; (2.) its noble value.—Ministry in the gospel is no function of death, but a proclamation of life in Christ Jesus.—Eternal life for the Christian is in part something actual, and in part something future.—The communion of saints.—The high value of spiritual ties superior to those of flesh and blood.—God the Father communicates His highest gifts of grace to us, not otherwise than in personal fellowship with Christ.

STARKE: *Bibl. Würt.:* All true teachers are spiritual fathers of their Christian and devout hearers (1 Cor. iv. 15).—CRAMER: Teachers and scholars should love one another as parents and children (2 Cor. xii. 15; 1 Thess. v. 13).

VON GERLACH: "Life in Christ is to the Apostle, standing at the end of his course, even in view of the last, most bitter conflict, of the utmost moment."

II.

Expression of the thankful remembrance of Paul at the continuous friendly relations with the beloved Timothy.

CH. I. 3–5.

3 I thank God, whom I serve from *my* forefathers with [in = ἐν] pure conscience, that without ceasing I have remembrance of thee [how that unceasingly
4 I have remembrance respecting thee] in my prayers night and day;[1] Greatly desiring to see thee, being mindful of thy tears, that I may be filled with
5 joy; [,] When I call[2] to remembrance [having remembrance of] the unfeigned faith that is in thee, which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois, and thy mother Eunice; and I am persuaded that in thee also.

[1] Ver. 3.—[Lachmann connects νυκτὸς κ. ἡμέρας with the words that follow. Tischendorf with the *Recepta* and the majority, with the preceding.—E. H.]

[2] Ver. 5.—Instead of λαμβάνων, λαβών is to be read here. The whole weight of authority favors it; A. C. F. G., and others. Tischendorf, Lachmann, Sin.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 3. **I thank God,** *χάριν ἔχω*; instead of the more usual *εὐχαριστῶ*. A genuine Pauline beginning (comp., *e. g.*, the Epistles to the Thessalonians), but doubly striking in these relations. The additional *μου* in some MSS. (see Tischendorf on this place), is nothing more than an imitation of Rom. i. 8.—**Whom I serve**; a relative expression, and it is entirely superfluous to inquire into the special object of the Apostle in the use of it. In a friendly communication like the one now in hand, expressions are not so carefully weighed and measured. It is enough if, from the subjective tone of the Apostle, they can be satisfactorily explained. For the rest, that in this testimony which Paul gives concerning himself there is anything objectionable when compared with 1 Tim. i. 13, has been maintained even by Chrysostom: "*Quandoque etiam dormitat bonus Homerus.*" De Wette still farther sees in it only a disjointed compilation. But if, indeed,

the Apostle had always been zealous to serve God in the best way, as well before as after his conversion, occasion might prompt him to speak of it; and yet here, just as in 2 Cor. i. 12, no charge can be brought against him of an idle self-glorification. With some critics it seems to be forbidden, at the peril of life and limb, to give expression to particular religious experiences more than once, and especially when given in statements in any degree modified.—**From my forefathers, ἀπὸ προγόνων**; not Abraham, or others, who, as a rule, are named πατέρες by Paul (Rom. ix. 5), but *progenitores proximi*, so that μου can be supplied. We know no particulars of the ancestors of the Apostle, but there is nothing to interfere with the supposition that they were truly God-fearing people; and in this case it is very conceivable that Paul treasured all the more, this historic continuity of the true service of God in his own family, since he himself died without leaving children behind him.—**With pure conscience.** A glance, this, at the sphere of the inner life in which the Apostle as well when Jew, as also later when Christian, had exercised this genuine service of God (comp. 1 Tim. i. 5).—**That . . . night and day** (*Wie ich* = how I). This incidental is connected with the previous participial clause; but we must be cautious about having recourse too quickly to the precarious assistance of parentheses.—Ὡς is to be translated *how* (Huther, Wiesinger), somewhat as in Gal. vi. 10, and signifies, indeed indirectly, that the thankfulness to which the Apostle here gives expression has reference to no one but Timothy.—**In my prayers night and day**; the latter words serve to strengthen the ἀδιάλειπτον, with which they are most intimately connected, and they bring into clearer distinctness the thought that Paul scarcely ceased to think of his friend and pupil when praying, and that he bore him continually on his heart in its supplications. It is hence unnecessary* to connect νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας with the following ἐπιποθῶν, as Matthies has proposed.

Ver. 4. **Greatly desiring,** &c. (comp. Rom. i. 11; Phil. i. 8). The utterance of such a desire, which the Apostle expressed also in other passages, is so much the more natural here, as he sees his life approach rapidly its end (comp. chap. iv. 21). In a most artless manner one participle here is subordinated to the other. "The longing after Timothy occasions the continual thought of him in the prayers of the Apostle, and it is nourished by the recollection of Timothy's tears;" Huther.—**Thy tears.** Most probably those shed by Timothy on his last departure from Paul, like those of the Ephesian elders in an earlier day (Acts xx. 37).—**That I may be filled with joy**; if, indeed, he shall see Timothy again. We learn here how full of feeling the character of Timothy was, and, indeed, no less that of Paul himself (comp. Acts. xx. 37). "*Lacrymæ flos cordis, aut summam hypocrisin aut summam sinceritatem indicant. Ludibrium ex lacrymis indicium est pravitatis sæculi nostri;*" Bengel.

Ver. 5. **When I call to remembrance.** Luther less accurately: "*und erinnere mich.*" Ὑπόμνησιν must here, as usually in the New Testament, be understood *sensu activo* (comp. 2 Peter, i. 13; iii. 1). The Apostle also here says, that through some circumstances, not farther indicated to us, his recollection was aroused touching something indeed which he knew already, but which now he had observed anew, viz., the unfeigned faith which dwelt in Timothy. Ammonius: "ἀνάμνησις, ὅταν τις ἔλθῃ εἰς μνήμην τῶν παρελθόντων, ὑπόμνησις δέ, ὅταν ὑφ' ἑτέρου εἰς τοῦτο προαχθῇ.—**The unfeigned faith, ἀνυπόκριτος**; a real trueness of faith, which, proceeding from the most inward, most living conviction, stands opposed to all sham and to all outward appearance.—**Which dwelt first,** &c. He who loves to name specialities of the kind, "something altogether too singular," can indeed be a master in grammatical exegesis, but certainly not in psychological. Such details, in a private letter like this now before us, were just as natural upon the part of Paul as they must have been agreeable and edifying to Timothy; while, on the other hand, a forger would, without doubt, have taken pains to avoid special items, which could subserve *no tendency* (*tendenz*). There is no need, still further, of the supposition (Origen) that the mother and grandmother of Timothy were also relatives of Paul. It is enough that the Apostle had met both women on his tour of inspection at Lystra and Derbe (Acts xvi.), and had learned to value them as followers of the Lord.—*First*, πρῶτον; many years before the conversion of Timothy ("*fortasse ante natum Timotheum;*" Bengel), had faith dwelt in his grandmother and in his mother. It was not a bare, fleeting, momentary feeling, but an abiding, indwelling principle (comp. Eph. iii. 17); and in like manner also the Apostle is fully persuaded (πέπεισμαι—expression of confident expectation) that the same living faith dwelt also in Timothy himself, "*quia fides est tibi quasi hereditaria*" (Cornel. a Lapide in this place).—**Lois** = the better known Λαΐς.—Εὐνίκη = Victoria. Although the μάμμη usually denotes mother, yet it also often is used for grandmother, as is necessarily the case here, owing to the context. Timothy can also in a measure, what Paul wholly could declare, that he served God ἀπὸ προγόνων, which represents still more an affinity and likeness between the two.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Although piety can by no means be named a natural inheritance, yet it may be said that, in many families, faith and love are transmitted from parents to children, and that Christian fathers and mothers save not only themselves, but also their households (comp. Acts xvi. 31). God-fearing families and households, in which faith is a perpetual treasure, and which renews itself in a certain degree within them, are in contrast with the ungodly. Many illustrations can be found collected in Lange's interesting treatise, *Blutsverwandte als Geistesverwandte in der Kirchen- und Weltgeschichte*, in GELZER's *Monatsblätter*, November, 1859.

2. As Timothy, in respect of his spiritual life, was indebted extremely to his mother and grandmother, so is the kingdom of God rich in proofs of the blessings which pious mothers have secured for their subsequently distinguished sons. As examples, we name the following: Mary, Salome, Anthusa, Monica, Nonna, and others. Compare the beautiful observations of Neander, in the first part of the "Memorials," and, still farther, Lange's treatise *Ueber den Antheil des weiblichen Geschlechts an der Entwickelung und Geschichte der Christlichen Kirche*, in GELZER's *Monatsblätter*, August, 1858.

3. In the character of Paul, it is remarkable that

* [It may not be necessary, and yet well.—E. H.]

the greatest extremes meet in him without neutralizing each other. The same Apostle, who deserves to be named a model of robust manliness, stands here before our eyes agitated by the most delicate, womanly feeling, and yet far removed from an effeminate sentimentality. By the recollection of the tears of Timothy already is his heart touched, and the joy which he desires most of all, is to behold once more the face of his friend and disciple. The man who in his mission-plans embraced the whole Jewish and Gentile world, has, at the same time, an open eye for individual family relationships, and can comprehend the little world of the hidden life of faith of a few modest provincial people. The teacher who could secure from his youthful disciple the recognition of his apostolic authority, did not think it beneath his dignity to call up before his vision the kindly image of his mother and grandmother. The Apostle, whose gaze lost itself in the far future, abandoned himself with evident satisfaction to the friendly reminiscences of a beautiful past.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Paul a pattern of obedience towards his own prescript: "In eveything give thanks" (1 Thess. v. 18). The high value of the recollections of a beautiful youth, especially at the close of the Christian's course.—As sorrowful, yet always rejoicing (2 Cor. vi. 10).—The longing of love.—The duty of Christian intercession.—The communion of saints: (1.) In their rich enjoyments; (2.) in their painful limitations.—The infinite sublimity of the Christian fellowship of spirit, raised above the narrow limits of time and space.—The proportionate value of tears in the Christian life.—Thankfulness and prayer are most closely bound together (comp. Col. iv. 2).—Home education the school for the formation of true piety.—Christian faith in its morning (Timothy), at noon (Eunice), and at the evening of life (Lois).—How Christian faith brings back again youth to old age, and imparts, on the other hand, to youth something of the earnestness and dignity of age.—No love without genuine trust, yet genuine trust does not mean credulity.

STARKE: Well is it for children to have pious parents, who from their youth will be led to godliness.—Good breeding ends with good bearing.—The parents' sighs are the children's defence.

LISCO: The memory of affection.—BENGEL: At the end of the journey there is something specially lovely in the thought of devout ancestors.—The older we become, so much the more do we perceive that our own life, in itself considered—our immediate activity—amounts but to little.—It becomes ever clearer that *we count* only in fellowship, not in our isolation.—Hence, it is in fact, and according to a wise ordering of God, completely necessary that we shall hold ourselves in humility.—HEUBNER: The throne of God is the place of union of separated friends.—The desire of one Christian friend to see another, must spring especially from the expectation of receiving with him new strength and joy for life, through the intercourse.—Piety drunk in with the mother's milk passes over truly into sap and blood.

III.

Exhortation to Timothy to stir up and to apply well the gifts of grace which had been conferred upon him.—The motive hereto; reference to the example of Paul, and others.

CH. I. 6–18.

6 Wherefore I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God,
7 which is in thee by [through] the putting on of my hands. For God hath not
given us the spirit of fear; [,] but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind[1]
8 [self-restraint]. Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord,
nor of me his prisoner: but be thou partaker of the afflictions[2] of the gospel
9 according to the power of God; [,] Who hath [omit "hath"] saved us, and called
us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own
purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began[3]
10 [before the ages]; But is now made manifest by [through] the appearing of
our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath [both][4] abolished death, and hath brought
11 life and immortality [incorruption] to light through the gospel: [,] Whereunto
[In respect of which] I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a
12 teacher of the Gentiles. For the [omit "the"] which cause I also suffer these
things: nevertheless I am not ashamed; for I know whom I have believed, and
am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed[5] unto him
13 against [unto] that day. Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast
14 heard of [from] me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. That good thing
[fair trust] which was committed unto [to] thee, keep by [through] the Holy
15 Ghost which [who] dwelleth in us. This thou knowest, that all they which
are [all those] in Asia be turned away from me; of whom are Phygellus[6] and

16 Hermogenes. The Lord give mercy unto the house of Onesiphorus; for he oft
17 refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain: [,] But, when he was in
18 Rome, he sought me out very diligently,[7] and found *me*. The Lord grant unto
him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day: and in how many things
he ministered unto me at Ephesus, thou knowest very well [better].

[1] Ver. 7.—[σωφρονισμοῦ = self-restraint. It would, amongst other things, restrain "the passion of fear;" Conybeare and Howson.—E. H.]
[2] Ver. 8.—[συγκακοπάθησον = suffer evil along with, together with ἐμέ. Sin., συγκακ.—E. H.]
[3] Ver. 9.—[πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων = *ante tempora secularia;* Vulg. These times began with the creation of the world; Huther.—E. H.]
[4] Ver. 10.—Instead of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. The English version loses sight of the force of μέν and δέ in this sentence. The Vulgate has *quidem* and *autem:* perhaps we should say: "Who hath *both* abolished death, *and* hath brought," &c.—E. H.]
[5] Ver. 12.—[παραθήκην is the reading adopted by the critical editors.—Sin. also; instead of the παρακαταθήκην of the *Recepta*.—E. H.]
[6] Ver. 15.—[Lachmann and Tischendorf, so also Sin., spell φύγελος, and not φύγελλος. Vulg., Phi(y)gelus.—E. H.]
[7] Ver. 17.—[σπουδαίως, by Lachmann, after C. Δ., Orig.; so also Sin. Tischendorf retains σπουδαιότερον.—E. H.]
[Lachmann's punctuation of this section is noticeable.—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 6. **Wherefore I put thee in remembrance.** With these words the Apostle introduces an exhortation which is farther elaborated in the whole chapter, and founded in differing motives. Δι' ἣν αἰτίαν refers back clearly to what immediately precedes. Just because Paul knows that the faith of the mother and the grandmother of Timothy dwelt in him also, he has the candor to address an exhortation to him, which would have been entirely out of place to an unbeliever—*I put thee in remembrance*, ἀναμιμνήσκω; I remind thee, *hortandi notione inclusâ;* Wahl.—**That thou stir up the gift of God.** Ἀναζωπυρεῖν, composed of ἀνά and ζωπυρεῖν; properly, to kindle again into a blaze the half-concealed coals under the ashes—to quicken them anew. Hence the significance of the revivifying of the inner spiritual fire. The LXX. use the same word (Gen. xlv. 27), for the Hebrew חָיָה. The gift of which Paul here speaks is compared with a fire, precisely as in 1 Thess. v. 19, which is capable both of decrease and increase. The Apostle here, as in 1 Tim. iv. 14, alludes to the gift of the calling (*Lehrberuf*) received from God, and addresses Timothy not as a Christian simply, but chiefly as teacher. It is somewhat premature to infer from this exhortation that Timothy was not fervent in spirit (Rom. xii. 11). Certainly the holy fire was in him, but it should blaze forth in a yet brighter flame.—What teacher might not need continually such an exhortation, without our construing it into an indirect censure upon him? In the main, it contains nothing else and farther than what is written in 1 Tim. vi. 11, 12; 2 Tim. ii. 15.—**By the putting on of my hands** (comp. 1 Tim. iv. 14). The Apostle had, it is likely, taken personal part in the solemnity there mentioned; and it harmonizes fully with the more fatherly and confidential character of his second Epistle, that he emphasizes specially this his personal share in the transaction.

Ver. 7. **For God hath not given us.** The exhortation to increase spiritual capital becomes strengthened by reference to that which has been received already. Paul is himself conscious that he has received one and the self-same πνεῦμα with Timothy; and knows, likewise, on the ground of his own experience, how it operates, and what. This he states, first negatively, and then also positively. It is no **spirit of fear,** δειλίας (comp. Rom. viii. 15); with this distinction, however, that there, slavish fear *before God*, while here feeble timidity *before men*, is referred to as being in direct contradiction with the peculiar character of the Christian spirit. It appears obviously, that Timothy, who was of gentle disposition, borne down by manifold discouraging cares, was in special danger, more than others, of yielding weakly to despondency, without, however, being justly obnoxious to the suspicion of defect in his faith, or of unfaithfulness in his work. "Timothy seems, from the persecutions which the cause of the gospel encountered, and especially from what Paul had suffered, to have become inwardly affected and crippled (?) in his activity. We cannot well reach any other conclusion from the πνεῦμα δειλίας of 2 Tim. i. 7. He did not exercise the duties of the office conferred upon him with the freedom and energy which the relations of the community demanded."—**But of power, and of love, and of a sound mind.** The first characteristic stands opposed to faint-heartedness; the two other qualities are added, apparently, by the Apostle, so that it may be distinctly manifest that he recommends no wild, rough exhibitions of force, but only such as were confined within legal limits. The ἀγάπη renders us capable for the offering of the greatest sacrifice for the cause of the Lord; the σωφρονισμός is that Christian self-control which imparts power to a wise bearing in action, and in all things knows how to keep within true bounds.

Ver. 8. **Be not thou therefore ashamed . . . of his prisoner.** From what he had stated generally in vers. 6 and 7, the Apostle now proceeds (in vers. 8–12) to particulars. He had declared of himself (in Rom. i. 16), that he was not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, since it is a power of God unto salvation. Now it is his wish that Timothy shall freely make the same confession, although ridicule and shame attend the preaching of the gospel.—**Of the testimony of our Lord,** is not the martyrdom of Christ Himself, nor even the testimony of the death of the Lord upon the cross in particular, but, in general, the testimony of the truth which, by and with the preaching of the gospel, was set forth, and of which preaching, the Lord Jesus Christ was chief person and centre. Very naturally, this admonition is connected with what immediately precedes: "*Timorem pudor comitatur, victo timore fugit pudor malus;*" Bengel.—**Nor of me his prisoner.** The one thing was inseparably bound up with the other. Were Timothy ashamed freely to preach the Lord, then he

would be in the highest degree unwilling to confess that he stood in any intimate relation with the imprisoned Paul. In the mind of the Apostle himself, his bonds were his badge of honor, which he would be willing at no price to forego (comp. Acts xxvi. 29; Gal. vi. 17). How thence could it be a matter of indifference to him, if any one, and especially Timothy, should be offended at them?—**But be thou partaker,** &c. Instead of avoiding, through an ignominious retreat, suffering in behalf of the good cause, Timothy must rather courageously submit to it. Συγκακοπάθησον τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ; not, suffer with the gospel, bear with it the disgrace attached to it, but, suffer *with me*, who also am suffering (σύν) *for* the gospel, which must be preached at any risk, and is thoroughly deserving of the grandest sacrifices. Τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, a *dativus commodi*, wholly like Phil. i. 27. And in order to repel every possible objection, as if the fulfilment of this heavy demand might far surpass the powers of Timothy, the Apostle now adds: **according to the power of God;** which words are not to be understood as in apposition with τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, but with συγκακοπάθησον. The Divine power which was already (according to ver. 7) in Timothy, would fit him for the offering of the heaviest sacrifice.

Ver. 9. **Who saved us.** That Timothy might be still more emphatically aroused to courageous endurance, Paul reminds him of the infinite wealth of the salvation, to the personal enjoyment of which he had come through the very same gospel. Here also, as usually in the Pastoral Epistles, God is set forth as σωτήρ of the faithful through Christ. Of this σωτηρία, Paul and Timothy, like all believers, are actual partakers. The means through which this σωτηρία becomes theirs, Paul signifies epexegetically when he speaks here of *the calling*. In this passage, moreover, as generally with the Apostle, we must not think of a mere outward calling which happens without any distinction between believers and unbelievers, but of an outward and an *inward* calling, to which man, on his part, has responded through the obedience of faith (comp. Rom. viii. 30). It is in the highest degree arbitrary to think here exclusively of a special calling to the office of a Christian teacher (Heydenreich), since it is evident from the context that nothing else than the general Christian calling is meant. It is called holy not so much because it proceeds forth from the Holy Ghost, but chiefly because it urges and obliges to holiness. But wherein the origin of this wholly incomparable advantage is to be found, the Apostle states in what immediately follows: **Not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace,** &c. A genuine Pauline compendium of his preaching of the gospel (comp. Rom. iii. 24; Eph. i. 4). The standard (κατά) is not our works (comp. Titus iii. 5; Eph. ii. 8, 9), but solely and alone the free grace of God, the only ground of which is in Himself (αὐτοκίνητος), and is excited, merited, or called forth through nothing in the creature. Consequently, the emphasis here must be placed upon ἴδιος; and the grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, is to be regarded as the actualization of God's idea of that which He had purposed in Himself (comp. Eph. i. 10). "What God determines in eternity, is as good as already made actual in Time;" De Wette. Here, as always with Paul, Christ is represented as the centre of Divine grace (χάρις). That this grace is already bestowed **before the world began,** πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, is a proof, moreover, that it is entirely independent of the works of men. "*Ab ordine temporis, argumentatur, nobis salutem gratis esse datam, quam minime eramus promeriti. Nam si ante mundi creationem elegit nos Deus, non potuit operum habere rationem, quæ nulla erant, quum nondum essemus ipsi. Nam quod sophistæ cavillantur, Deum operibus, quæ prævidebat, fuisse adductum, non longa solutione indiget. Qualia enim futura erant opera, si essemus a Deo præteriti, quum omnium bonorum fons et initium sit ipsa electio?*" Calvin. "From the order of time he adduces argument that salvation is given to us freely, we being in no degree deserving of it. For if God chose us before the creation of the world, he could not have the ground (*rationem*) of works, which were null when we were not yet in existence. For the cavil of the sophists, that God was governed by the works He foresaw, does not need a lengthened discussion. For what were future works, had we been passed by by God, since election itself is the fountain and beginning of all good works?"

Ver. 10. **But is now made manifest,** &c. Over against what God had purposed from eternity, the Apostle sets forth now what He had done in the fulness of time to realize His determination. He means a φανέρωσις, not only through the word of the gospel, but through the highest deed of Divine love, visible in the manifestation of Christ. The Apostle states a sort of antithesis to this in Rom. xvi. 25. The *manifestation* of the Lord, ἐπιφάνεια, is not only His coming into the world *per se*, but His earthly manifestation in its complete circumference; and the fulness of blessing from it is expressed, negatively and positively, in these words: **Who abolished death, and brought life and incorruption to light.** The antithesis of life and death is thoroughly Pauline. Both words here must be understood also in their full force. By *death*, we must not think simply of the moment of separation between body and soul, but of that death which, as the wages of sin, forms a decided opposition to spiritual and eternal life, ζωή. We must think of death as the power which has seized the entire man, body and soul, in consequence of sin, and which makes physical the precursor of moral death (Wiesinger). *Life*, on the other hand, is that true, spiritual life, which is perfectly identical with the highest happiness, is enjoyed, indeed, this side the grave, is not destroyed by death, and is perfected beyond. The exegetical clause, καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν, denotes it as eternal, imperishable; so that the idea coincides nearly with the ζωὴ αἰώνιος of John. Christ now has *destroyed* this death. Καταργεῖν signifies here also, as in 1 Cor. xv. 26; Heb. ii. 14, such a destruction that death is despoiled of his whole power. "*In Græcis scriptoribus hoc sensu legere non memini;*" Winer. Already now, for believers, death is nothing; the time will come when it shall cease to be. On the other hand, Christ has *brought to light* life and immortality. Φωτίζειν, an expression which is chosen all the more appropriately here, since also the power of death is a power of *darkness*. Not only because Christ has imparted this life and immortality to His own (Huther), but chiefly because He has revealed this, and placed it before our eyes, can it be said of Him that He has brought both forth from darkness into light. Never would the world have experienced what eternal life and immortality, in the full mean-

ing of the words, are, had it not beheld them in Christ. We are not accustomed to think here exclusively of the death and resurrection of Christ, although these are in no way excluded. Through His entire manifestation and activity He has bestowed upon us the blessings here mentioned. For the rest, it is obvious that the revelation of life which is given in Christ is likewise, for believers in Him, a communication of life.—**Through the gospel**; here brought forward as the instrument through which the revelation of life, which was given objectively in Christ, comes subjectively to the knowledge of believing Christians. The gospel is not considered here simply as doctrine, but also as the power of God to save all who believe in it (Rom. i. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 13).

Ver. 11. **Whereunto . . . a teacher of the Gentiles** (comp. 1 Tim. ii. 7). This also is an addition, which does not spring from apologetical considerations, but from the personal heart-necessities of the Apostle. It is as if he felt with twofold force the need of setting forth to himself, in his deep humiliation, his high rank. The accumulation of the words here is in no way a tautology. Κῆρυξ is the general signification of the Christian office of teaching, which embraces also evangelists and prophets. Of this genus, ἀπόστολος is a species, while διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν is the designation of the *sphere* in which the apostolate of Paul moves. There is no sufficient ground for removing ἐθνῶν* from the text, as critically suspicious.

Ver. 12. **For which cause,** &c. Here also, as in ver. 6, δι' ἣν αἰτίαν belongs to what immediately precedes. Because, indeed, I am appointed a preacher, &c., καὶ ταῦτα πάσχω. The Apostle thinks of his present imprisonment, with all the calamities connected with it, which for Timothy require no more explicit description.—'Αλλ' οὐκ ἐπαισχύνομαι; namely, of the suffering which I must bear for the Lord's cause. The Apostle wishes, evidently, to encourage Timothy, through his own example, to carry out his prescript (ver. 8). And upon the question whether it be possible for him to reach such a height, he refers to the source of his own joyfulness.—**For I know,** &c. Ὦ πεπίστευκα; *pudorem pellit fiducia futuri;* Bengel. Christ might be the implied subject of discourse (comp. ver. 10); but it is more evident that God is (comp. Acts xxvii. 25; Titus iii. 8), although it is obvious that not God in Himself, but specially God in Christ, is the object of the believing confidence of the Apostle. That which immediately follows, shows upon what ground this trust can be so firm and unwavering.—**And am persuaded that he is able,** &c. The certitude here expressed is that of living faith, the object of which is the almightiness of God.—**To keep that which I have committed,** &c., τὴν παραθήκην μου (comp. 1 Tim. vi. 20). As the same word is used in ver. 14 in this chapter, the presumption is, that in all these places the same thing is denoted; which certainly is possible, though by no means necessary. If we understand the word in the sense in which it is used in 1 Tim. vi. 20, then we must think necessarily of the apostolic function (De Wette, Otto, and others), and find this thought: I am persuaded that the Lord, according to His might, will ever guard that, the administration of which He has entrusted to me, &c. But how could the Lord guard, in the strict sense of the word, *the office* of Paul, when Paul himself should no longer be upon the earth, while, in fact, he was expecting to fall asleep before the Parousia? Hence it is more simple, by τὴν παραθήκην μου, to think of something which Paul, on his part, had confided to the Lord, and had given in trust as a costly treasure, so that now he would not be solicitous about it even for a moment. And on the question what this could be, it is altogether the simplest, we hold, to think here of the eternal salvation of his soul, and also to understand the word in the sense in which Calvin wrote upon this place: "*Observa etiam nomen depositi pro vita æterna; nam inde colligimus, non alitur in manu Dei salutam nostram esse, ac sunt in manu depositarii, quæ ipsius fidei custodienda tradimus. Si penes nos esset salus nostra, quot assidue periculis exposita fore?? Nunc vero bene est, quod apud talem custodem reposita omni discrimine est superior.*"—("Observe also the name *deposit* for life eternal: for we collect thence that our salvation is not otherwise in the hand of God than those things are in the hands of a trustee, which we yield under the guardianship of faith itself. If salvation were in our keeping, how constantly would it be exposed to dangers. Now indeed it is well that it is in the keeping of such a custodian, and above all risk.") Other views can be found collected and examined by De Wette and Huther on this place. By the indefiniteness of the expression, and the absence of any clearer indication in the context, it is difficult to hit upon a view which leaves no single difficulty remaining. —**Against that day**; the day of the coming of Christ, when that which is hidden shall be brought to light, and the crown of life shall be given to all who love His appearing (comp. chap. iv. 8).

Ver. 13. **Hold fast the form,** &c. "*Repetit præceptum de conservanda puritate doctrinæ, quod sæpissime in divinis concionibus recitatur. Et summa comprehensa est in hoc dicto: si quis aliud Evangelium docuerit, anathema sit. Usus est Paulus hic singulari verbo: retineas formam sanorum verborum,* i. e., *quæ tibi antea declineata est. Vult et res ipsas retineri et modos loquendi perspicuos et usitatos prophetis et apostolis. Quamquam enim non superstitiose postulat ubique eadem verba recitari, tamen vult vitari ambiguitates et* λογομαχίας;" Melanchthon. ("He repeats the precept concerning the preservation of the purity of doctrine, which is most frequently uttered in Divine addresses. And the sum is comprised in this saying: If any one shall have taught another gospel, let him be anathema. Paul uses here the verb singular: hold fast the form of sound words—*i. e.*, which has been set forth to thee before. He desires that both things be held fast, and also the clear modes of speaking, and such as were customary with apostles and prophets. For although he does not superstitiously demand that the same words be everywhere recited, he wishes nevertheless that ambiguities and λογομαχίαι be avoided.") By ὑποτύπωσις is to be understood a brief sketch of Christian doctrine over against an extended treatise. Some commentators (*e. g.*, Herder) have thought here of a written draft, which Paul had left behind as a guide to Timothy. But in this case Paul would not have said, **which thou hast heard of me,** but, *which I have sketched for thee.* He has certainly written the *form* here indicated, but in such a style as is meant, *e. g.*, in 2 Cor. iii. 3. Upon the mind of Timothy the ὑποτύπωσις was impressed in indelible colors, and therefore he

* [Omitted in A.—E. H.]

could do nothing better than to keep himself up to it as closely as possible. Ἔχειν also here is equivalent to κατέχειν, as well as φυλάσσειν, ver. 14.—**In faith,** &c. (not, of faith and of love; Luther). No indication, this, of what were *the contents* of sound words, but an exhibition of *the style and way* in which Timothy should hold fast the words of the Apostle. Not in an outward, mechanical way, but also that faith and love might be like a vase in which the model referred to would be preserved; so that for that reason likewise also, it was the personal and spiritual characteristic of Timothy. If this last existed, then would he reproduce independently, without the slightest injury to the truth, the sound words of the Apostle, and repeat them, in no degree only as an echo, in a lifeless way. By the addition, **love which is in Christ Jesus,** is signified that this love must be kept up and preserved in personal life-fellowship with the Lord Jesus Christ. This love of the heart sharpens the memory of the understanding in the preservation of the sound words, as this is seen, *e. g.*, in the Evangelist John, who in his advanced age was still in condition to repeat the extended dialogues and discourses of the Lord.

Ver. 14. **That good thing which was committed unto thee, keep,** &c. A concluding exhortation, in which all that is said in vers. 6–13 is yet once briefly summed up. (Upon παραθήκη, see on 1 Tim. vi. 20). There is no adequate ground for understanding this word here wholly in the same sense as in ver. 12. There the Apostle spoke of a deposit (*depositum*) with which he had entrusted his God; here, on the other hand, he speaks of a cause which God had confided to Timothy. Many interpreters think exclusively of the sound words spoken of in ver. 13; but in this case there would be a flat tautology. This exhortation is referred more appropriately, perhaps, to ver. 6, and by παραθήκη is understood the χάρισμα τοῦ Θεοῦ which Timothy had received for the work of his ministry. This trust committed to him is named *good*, in the same sense in which the Apostle earlier (1 Tim. vi. 12) had spoken of the good fight of faith. Timothy ought to *keep* this free from all harm, not through his own strength, but through the strength of the Holy Ghost who *dwells* in us, the believing, without distinction, and along with Whom the power to remain true and steadfast is imparted. "Timothy should not apply any human instrument to the keeping of the παραθήκη; the only instrument must be the Holy Ghost; that is, he must permit Him to rule and work without trammels and freely in him, and do only that to which He directs him" (Huther).

Ver. 15. **This thou knowest, that all,** &c. As a warning for Timothy, who ought to see, in the examples alleged, the consequences of a want of watchfulness, Paul reminds him of what he had suffered at the hands of the unfaithful Asiatics. *This thou knowest*, οἶδας τοῦτο; the thing itself is known indeed to Timothy, but it is here most appropriately recalled to his memory. "It is indeed very natural, that while he exhorts one to courage, he sets before him examples of cowardice and inconstancy" (Schleiermacher). Perhaps, moreover, the place admits of translation in the form of a question, thus: "Knowest thou indeed this?" Οἶδας τοῦτο = ἀγάπας με (John xxi. 15). The matter itself to which Paul here alludes is somewhat obscure. By **Asia,** Asia proconsularis is to be understood here—Mysia, Phrygia, Lydia, and Caria (*Asia cis Taurum*, or, according to Ptolemy, ἡ ἰδίως καλουμένη Ἀσία). There is no occasion, in the meanwhile, to think, by *those who are in Asia*, (ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ), exclusively of the teachers of false doctrines, since through their errors they had already become separated from Paul in principle. There were also believers in general, who, after they had first followed the Apostle to a certain point, had, in a way not known to us, turned from him. Ἀποστρέφειν = *aversari*, to turn the face from any one, to turn the back upon; also, inwardly to renounce any one. A wide field for conjecture has here opened itself to exegetes. The most prevalent view (Chrysostom, Theodoret, *et al.*) is, that persons from Asia Minor, who, upon some occasion, had come to Rome during this imprisonment of the Apostle, were ashamed of him in his bonds, and had not taken any notice of him. The view also has some probability, that certain persons had come to Rome from Asia Minor with the design, originally, to serve Paul as witnesses upon his trial, but, when they observed that his cause would terminate unfavorably, had prudently withdrawn. The only difficulty, then, were that we should expect to read, οἱ ἐκ Ἀσίας, while ἐν Ἀσίᾳ is written. If we bear in mind, however, that they had their dwelling in Asia, and that, when this Epistle was written, they had returned thither, this difficulty disappears. Others think otherwise. Of **Phygellus and Hermogenes,** whom Paul mentions here by name, either because their conduct had affected him most unpleasantly, or also because they were specially known to Timothy, we discover no farther trace. Over against these, was the bearing of him of whom honorable mention is made in part in vers. 16–18, doubly praiseworthy.

Ver. 16. **The Lord give mercy . . . Onesiphorus.** The Onesiphorus here mentioned was probably, too, an "Asiatic," dwelling at Ephesus (see chap. iv. 19). It is not impossible that he was a merchant, and had come to Rome upon business, and felt himself impelled, by this opportunity, to manifest his sympathy in the fate of the Apostle. The express mention of his **house,** and the pious wish of the Apostle for Onesiphorus himself (ver. 18), gave occasion to the supposition that this disciple dwelt no longer among the living when this Epistle was written. Be this as it may, **he oft refreshed me,** writes the Apostle; through practical proofs of love, and not, indeed, merely through meat and drink (De Wette), but through everything he had done, to give joy to the heart of the Apostle. Ἀνέψυξεν an ἅπαξ λεγόμ., which signifies, in general, to cool off, to refresh. Indeed, this one circumstance, which Paul here expressly mentions, was not without some influence upon his exhortation (ver. 8).—**And was not ashamed of my chain;** had also contributed richly to his comfort. Onesiphorus had acted, in fact, in a way entirely in contrast with the others who were "of Asia."

Ver. 17. **But when he was . . . and found me.** In a city so populous, in which there could be no scarcity of prisoners held under the most diversified accusations, it was not easy, indeed, to find the imprisoned Apostle, especially since whosoever put too definite inquiries, thereby perilled his own safety. Onesiphorus, meanwhile, as he himself probably afterwards informed the Apostle, shrank from no inquiries, allowed himself no rest, until he had found his forsaken friend. Here also is a proof that the relations of the second imprisonment were far unpleasanter than those of his first (comp. Acts

xxviii. 30–31). According to the evidence of A. C. D.[1] F. G., and other MSS., σπουδαίως seems to deserve preference to the usual reading, σπουδαιότερον.

Ver. 18. **The Lord grant unto him . . . in that day.** What the Apostle himself cannot repay, that, he hopes, the Most High Judge will. Were Onesiphorus already asleep, then also it follows from this place that the Apostle thought of the supreme decision as not occurring immediately after death, but first in the day of the παρουσία of the Lord, whose appearing he, in the meanwhile, represented as wholly near at hand, so that the interval between death and that great event, for his way of thinking, was fused into an insignificant moment.—**The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord**; a form of speech without art, in which we may take the second κύριος for the pronoun *reflexivum*, παρ' ἑαυτοῦ. But in case it is believed necessary to distinguish the subjects, then by the second κυρίος Christ must be certainly understood; by the first, either God the Father, or God in the entire fulness and incommunicability of His essence. —**And in how many things he ministered**, &c. The Apostle does not speak here exclusively of the services done *unto him* (so Luther: "How much he has served *me*," &c.), but wholly in a general way of the services which Onesiphorus, at Ephesus, had rendered to the cause of God's kingdom. This, Timothy, as dwelling there, knows *very well—better*, *e. g.*, than the Apostle could tell him (comp. upon this Comparative, WINER, p. 217).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. As every true Christian has received his χάρισμα, so the most sacred obligation rests upon him to employ this gift without ceasing. The fire which is not blown upon, goes out; and the spiritual capital which we possess is ours only as long as we care unceasingly for its preservation and increase. Here, also, the word of the Lord applies: "He that hath, to him shall be given," &c. (Matt. xiii. 12). The means through which the awakening of this entrusted gift is brought about, are chiefly threefold: Prayer, whose breath makes the glimmering fire burn brighter; reading of the Word, through which the Spirit speaks to us, and is awakened in us; and the fellowship of the saints, through which the individual life is preserved from sickly conditions and death. Rightly says Melanchthon on this place: "*Homo renatus non es', ut statua, sed ideo datur Spiritus Sanctus, ut inchoëtur in nobis libertas, et possumus jam inchoare obedientiam, nec Spiritus Sanctus est otium, sed est flamma et agitatio divina, repugnans diabolo et infirmitati carnis et accedens motus tales, qualis ipse Spiritus Sanctus est. Huc pertinet tota parabola de negotiantibus, Luc.* xix." Divine and human agency move here inseparably together.

2. What *exercitia pietatis* in particular are to be recommended to the minister of the gospel, is a difficult question (comp. Observ. on 1 Tim. iv. 7). The Catholic (Roman) Church has surely done too much of a good thing, and laid upon the clergy a daily burden of private exercises (ἄσκησις), whereby the spirit is deadened, and valuable time is passed in a mechanical routine. On the other side, it is certainly to be deplored that so frequently the freedom of the evangelical clergyman, in this respect, is misspent for want of discipline, and that, in the due care for others, his own spiritual well-being is often entirely forgotten. Labor would doubtless be more successful, if the study were also more of a closet for prayer. Without precisely binding himself formally to a strict private rule (*privat agende*), as this, in the last age, was more than once recommended, it is not to be overlooked that the freest development of the spiritual life needs continuously training and guidance. To the helps which can be recommended freely without qualification, belongs, amongst the rest, the reading of biographies of those of the clergy within whom Christ has gained, above many others, a fulness of stature, as, *e. g.*, Louis Harms, Chalmers, Oberlin, Hofacker, Spleiss, and others.

3. Although Paul had laid his hands upon Timothy with desirable effect, still it in do degree follows that the ordinary communication of the Holy Ghost is bound up sacramentally with the laying on of hands, and that a character *indelibilis* must be ascribed to ecclesiastical ordination, as this is insisted upon by Rome, while appeal is made, amongst others, to ver. 6. There is here absolutely no mention of ordination in the later, hierarchical sense. The exhortation to stir up the Spirit, presupposes much more, that in spite of the ἐπίθεσις τῶν χειρῶν, He would otherwise become extinct, and in so far proves against rather than for the character *indelibilis*. Upon the treatment of Ordination in the spirit of Christ and of the evangelical Church, one can find striking words in NITZSCH, *Prakt. Theol.*, Bd. 2, p. 441 *et seq.*

4. To be ashamed of the cause of the Lord is possible enough, especially in gentler Melanchthon-natures, such also as Timothy seems to have been —natures which are better fitted for patient suffering than for courageous conflict for the truth. Here also the power of sin is manifest, that men are so often ashamed of the very thing which they should esteem their highest honor; and inversely, they find their highest honor in that which must produce their deepest shame. Fundamentally, sin has destroyed all, but grace restores again, all.

5. The doctrine of the free grace of God in the calling and election of the sinner, is one of the chief foundations in the structure of Pauline soteriology, and likewise one of the greatest treasures of the Church, reformed according to the word of God. He only who exaggerates and presses in an unspiritual way this doctrine, the supreme consolation of believers, can make it resemble a heathen fatalism. (Comp. P. Lange's treatise on the question, "What authority is due still to the peculiarity of the Reformed Church in the scheme of faith (*Glaubenslehre*) of our own time?" in the Miscellanies, New Series, ii., pp. 1–52. Bielefeld, 1860.)

6. Paul is to us (ver. 12) a speaking exemplar of the blessed certitude of faith, whereby the claim of many, that such certitude is the fruit of spiritual pride and idle conceit only, is strikingly contradicted. The Roman Catholic Church denies that the Christian, this side the grave, can be assured of his salvation; and upon this point many Protestants are almost cryptocatholic. Nevertheless, it is palpably clear that the believer does not build his certitude upon anything he finds or is competent to within himself, but upon the eternal grace and fidelity of God, which certainly will complete the good work (Phil. i. 6). Perhaps the misunderstanding of many would be removed, if less were said of the *perseverantia*, and more of the *conservatio sanctorum*.

[This is well expressed. I think, however, we

should distinguish between the *certitudo gratiæ* and the *certitudo beatitudinis æternæ*. Certitude is only one form of the *fiducia* which is the essence of justifying faith. Of this we may be, ought to be assured; but of the certitude of everlasting salvation we cannot speak as an essential or factor in the consciousness of the believer. It is very desirable that we revise our habits of teaching upon this article. The reader is referred to the following observations by the late Sir W. Hamilton ("Discussion on Philosophy," &c., London, 1852, on pp. 493, 494.) These are important in themselves, and tend to justify in an original style the remark so frequently made, that Protestants and Roman Catholics do not differ as much now as formerly in the article of Justification:

"Assurance, personal assurance (the feeling that God is propitious to *me*, that *my* sins are forgiven, *fiducia, plerophoria fidei*), was long universally held in the Protestant communities to be the criterion and condition of a true or saving faith. Luther declares that he who hath not assurance, spews faith out; and Melanchthon makes assurance the discriminating line of Christianity from heathenism. It was maintained by Calvin—nay, even by Arminius—and is part and parcel of all the Confessions of all the churches of the Reformation down to the Westminster Assembly. In that synod, *assurance* was in Protestantism, for the *first* time, declared *not to be of the essence* of faith; and, accordingly, the Scottish General Assembly has, subsequently, once and again condemned and deposed the holders of this, the doctrine of Luther, of Calvin, and of the older Scottish Church itself. In the English, and more articulately in the Irish Establishment, it still stands a necessary tenet of belief. Assurance is now, however, disavowed when apprehended by churchmen, high and low; but of these, many, like Mr. Hare, are blissfully incognizant of the opinion, its import, its history, and even its name. This dogma, with its fortune past and present, affords, indeed, a series of the most curious contrasts. It is curious that this cardinal point of Luther's doctrine should, without exception, have been constituted into the fundamental principle of all the churches of the Reformation, and, as their common and uncatholic doctrine, have been explicitly condemned at Trent. It is curious that this common doctrine of the churches of the Reformation should now be abandoned virtually in, or formally by, all these churches themselves. It is curious that Protestants should now generally profess the counter doctrine asserted at Trent in the condemnation of their own principle. It is curious that this, the most important *variation* in the faith of Protestants, as, in fact, a gravitation of Protestantism back towards Catholicity, should have been overlooked as indeed in his days undeveloped, by the keen-eyed author of "The History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches." Finally, it is curious that, though now fully developed, this central approximation of Protestantism to Catholicity should not, as far as I know, have been signalized by any theologian, Protestant or Catholic; whilst the Protestant symbol (*Fides sola justificat*—Faith alone justifies), though now eviscerated of its real import, and now only manifesting a difference of expression, is still supposed to discriminate the two religious denominations. For both agree that the three heavenly virtues must all concur to salvation; and they only differ, whether Faith, *as a word*, does or does not involve Hope and Charity. This misprision would have been avoided had Luther and Calvin only said, "*Fiducia sola justificat*," "Assurance alone justifies;" for, on their doctrine, assurance was convertible with true faith, and true faith implied the other Christian graces. But this primary and peculiar doctrine of the Reformation, is now harmoniously condemned by Roman Catholics and Protestants together."—E. H.]

7. The evangelical doctrine here alluded to (ver. 10), that the Lord has overcome death, is illustrated yet farther, chiefly from apostolical expressions, as 1 Cor. xv. 55–57; Heb. ii. 14. Upon the question, how and whereby Christ has achieved this victory, one can refer: 1. To his whole manifestation, by which the true life in its full glory is revealed; 2. to His death, through which sin, the sting of death, is atoned for, and the law, the strength of sin, is fulfilled; 3. to His resurrection on the third day, through which He has burst asunder the bands of death, and triumphed over the power of hell; 4. to His intercession in heaven, whence also He sends down His spirit unceasingly, who imparts the true life, and delivers from the spirit of death; 5. to His final παρουσία, with which He will banish death from the creation (1 Cor. xv. 26; comp. Rev. xxi. 4).

8. What Paul says of the Holy Ghost as *indwelling* within the believer, refers us to the highest blessing of the New Covenant, in which the Holy Ghost is the immanent vital principle of all the redeemed. During the Old Covenant, He overshadowed momentarily individual holy men of God; in the New, He abides perpetually in the heart of each Christian.

9. What the Apostle says in praise and recognition of the proofs of love shown to him by Onesiphorus, is also a practical explanation of the words of Jesus (Matt. xxv. 34–40).

10. In case, even, that Onesiphorus were really dead at the time of the writing of this Epistle, still the Roman Catholic interpreters are in error when they find, in ver. 18, a proof of the lawfulness and obligation for intercessory prayers for the dead. The case here was altogether special, and cannot, without great wilfulness, be applied as the foundation of a general rule for all the dead. On the other side, it is often forgotten that the gospel nowhere lays down a positive prohibition to follow with our wishes and prayers, if our heart impel us thereto, our departed while in the condition of separation; and hence, in any case, it is well to distinguish between the Christian idea which lies at the foundation of such inward needs, and the form of later church rite, and practice.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Fire is a striking image of the Holy Ghost in this, that it must be kept up and fanned without ceasing.—It is not enough to be in Christ; one must be rooted in Him, grow, and bring forth fruit.—Do ye not know of whose Spirit ye are children?—The Spirit of power, of love, and of a sound mind—a threefold chord, where no tone can be wanting or transposed without sharp dissonance.—False shame about the gospel of Christ: (1.) How general; (2.) how unfounded; (3.) how destructive it is.—The Christian (1.) *need* not be ashamed of the gospel; (2.) *dare* in no case; and (3.) also *will* not be ashamed of it, if he will in truth be a Christian.—It

is not enough to contend for the truth; one must know also how to suffer for it.—There is no better protection against false shame than firm faith in free grace.—The deficiency of merit, and the necessity of good works in the Christian's life of faith.—"*Nisi opera videam extra, non credam fidem esse intra;*" J. Huss.—Jesus the death-conqueror: (1.) The enemy which He, as such, overcomes; (2.) the peace which He, as such, restores; (3.) the crown which He, as such, merits.—In how far is death already conquered for the Christian, and in how far not yet? Comp. "Heidelberg Catechism," Ans. 42. —The gospel a revelation of life.—"I know in whom I believe," the sublimest science of faith.—A science has so much more a higher value, the more (1.) it moves in loftier spheres; (2.) is built upon firmer foundations; and (3.) presents a greater wealth in practical results. All this is true of this, as of no other science.—The way, degree, ground, and fruit of the Christian assurance of faith.—There is no firm hold in sound doctrine which could signify anything in Paul's judgment, as long as it is not coupled with personal faith and love in life; ver. 14. (1.) No servant of Christ is without a committed trust; (2.) there is no trust which does not require careful watching; (3.) no careful watching is conceivable without the power of the Holy Ghost dwelling within us.—Paul, as the Lord, was also forsaken in distress by unfaithful friends.—True Christian brotherly love (vers. 16–18) (1.) tested; (2.) confirmed; (3.) requited.—No labor of love which is positive, goes wholly unrewarded (Heb. vi. 9, 10).—Think of those in bonds, as bound with them (Heb. xiii. 3).

Starke: *Bibl. Würt.:* As sparks go out in the ashes when one does not rekindle them, so also the gifts of God are lost when they are not made use of for the glory of God, for the Church, for the public, and for the benefit of one's neighbor, as that for which they are bestowed (Matt. xxv. 30).—Langii *Opus B.:* The prisoner of Christ, nevertheless God's child, redeemed of Christ, and His ransomed possession, and yet His prisoner; this belongs to the mystery of the Cross.—The power of God, which is mighty in them that believe, one never sees more gloriously than in sorrow.—He who allows hands to be laid upon him for the office of preacher, allows them also to be laid upon him for imprisonment, if God so order (ver. 6).—Believers are already saved in the kingdom of grace.—Hedinger: Christ has obtained for us twofold blessings, *privativa* and *positiva;* He has taken away the noxious, and brought for us the salutary.—Wilt thou doubt thy salvation? As truly as thou believest, and art assured of thy faith, canst thou be assured of thy salvation.—Conflagration, plunder, and war take away all! What is there more?—The best is secured. It is on high, in heaven, well secured.—He who will have the assistance of the Holy Ghost, especially in the office of teaching, must have Him also as an indweller.—Starke: We think often, with Elijah, as if we were alone and forsaken; but God preserves for Himself always a Church amongst much erring, godless, and abandoned men (1 Kings xix. 14–18).—Faith is not high-minded; it associates affectionately with the most insignificant and miserable.—Canst thou not requite thy benefactors, then wish and pray heartily that God will (2 Sam. xix. 32–39).

Heubner: Inspiration must not be fanatical ecstasy.—To desert a friend and benefactor who is fallen into misery and disgrace, is baseness to the last degree.—Where apostolic earnestness is, can ignominy not long stay away.—The deliverance of the human race is the supremest wonder of Divine love; precisely therefore, also, there is no nobler office than the office of reconciliation.—The hope of immortality first through Christianity is firmly established.—If all Christians should possess the Holy Ghost, how much more the teachers.—Where there is no agreement with Jesus and the Apostles, there is no Holy Ghost.—The persecution of the shepherds shows what genuine sheep are.—Next to suffering for the sake of the gospel, the grandest thing is to support the persecuted against the world, to incur danger for them; as Jerome for Huss, Frederic the Wise for Luther.—Jesus recognizes that as done unto Himself (Matt. x. 40–41).

Lisco (vers. 8–14): The power of faith.—(Vers. 1–14): What ought to move Timothy to fidelity in faith and in the preaching of the gospel: (1.) The example of his ancestors; (2.) the gift of the Holy Ghost; (3.) the example of Paul.—(Vers. 7–14, Whitsun Sermon): The Spirit given to us.—Not fear, but love, is the mark of the Christian.—(Vers. 15–18): The conduct of the Christian towards true and false friends—that, amid prevailing unfaithfulness, love nevertheless should not grow cold.—To the merciful, the Lord gives grace here and there.

Leipoldt (ver. 12), in the collection, "Manifold Gifts and One Spirit," ii., p. 279: The blessed certitude of faith.—Palmer, sketch of a sermon for the close of the year, on the same text, *Evangelische Homiletik*, 4. *Aufl.*, *S.* 340.

Van der Palm (ver. 3), Reformation-Sermon: (1.) Through the Reformation we are once more in the possession of sound doctrine; (2.) This possession must make itself known through faith and love which are in Christ Jesus.—On ver. 8, comp. a sermon by Van Oosterzee on the cognate text, Rom. i. 16, in the *Langenberg* "Collection," 1852, pp. 225–250.

IV.

Instruction how and why Timothy should suffer for the cause of the Lord.

Ch. II. 1–13.

1 Thou therefore, my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus.
2 And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses[1] [in the
presence of many witnesses], the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall

3 be able [also] to teach others also. Thou therefore endure hardness[2] [suffer
4 thou affliction with me], as a good soldier of Jesus Christ.[3] No man that
warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of *this* life; that he may please
5 him who hath chosen him to be a soldier[4] [may please the commander]. And
if a man also strive for masteries, *yet* is he not crowned, except he strive law-
6 fully. The husbandman that laboreth must be first[5] partaker of the fruits.
7 Consider what I say;[6] and the Lord give[7] thee understanding in all things
8 [for the Lord will give thee, &c]. Remember that Christ Jesus, of the seed
9 of David, was raised from the dead according to my gospel: Wherein I suffer
trouble, as an evil-doer, *even* unto bonds; but the word of God is not bound.
10 Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sake [on account of the elect], that
they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory.
11 *It is* a faithful saying [Faithful is the saying]: for if we be dead with him, we
12 shall also live with him: If we suffer, we shall also reign with him: if we deny[8]
13 him, he also will deny us: If we believe not, *yet* he abideth faithful: [for][9] he
cannot deny himself.

[1] Ver. 2.—[*διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων* = *amid*, i. e., *in the presence of*, yet not = *ἐνώπιον*; so Huther. These witnesses *assisted* by their presence.—E. H.]

[2] Ver. 3.—*συγκακοπάθησον*. The ordinary text, *Leide dich*. The reading *συγκακοπάθησον* must, on the authority of A. C.[1] D.[1] E.[1] F. G., Sin., and others, be preferred to the usual *σὺ οὖν κακοπάθησον*. [Lachmann also reads *συγκακοπάθησον*.—E. H.]

[3] Ver. 3.—[Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ is preferable to Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; is supported by the weightiest authorities.—E. H.]

[4] Ver. 4.—[*τῷ στρατολογήσαντι*; badly translated in the English Version; though it would seem to have some support in the Vulgate—*cui se probavit*.—E. H.]

[5] Ver. 6.—[*πρῶτον*; so all the authorities and modern critical editions; but the Sin. reads *πρότερον*.—E. H.]

[6] Ver. 7.—[ἃ λέγω; Lachmann and Tischendorf, on the authority of the evidence, read ὅ. The Sin. also has ὅ.—E. H.]

[7] Ver. 7.—*δώσει*, not *δῴη*; see Tischendorf. [The English Version misses the sense, and leaves out the illative particle here, which has some emphasis.—E. H.]

[8] Ver. 13.—[The *Recepta* has *ἀρνούμεθα*. Lachmann, and, after him, Tischendorf, reads *ἀρνησόμεθα*. The authorities are in its favor.—E. H.]

[9] Ver. 13.—[The particle *γὰρ* was not in the text our translators used.—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **Thou therefore**, &c. After the statement (chap. i. 15–18) of the unfaithfulness of many, and the fidelity of one, he addresses himself to Timothy with new exhortations. If he have excited him (chap. i. 6–18) to stir up the gift within him as much as possible, without allowing himself to be held back through false shame, he now gives him express direction *how* and *why* he should suffer for the Lord's cause. "The glorious paragraph (vers. 1–13) contains, in compressed brevity, all that could animate and encourage not only the beloved pupil of the Apostle to fidelity in Christianity, but what also can strengthen the teachers and Christians of all ages to the firmest and most heroic resolution in faith and conflict;" Heydenreich.—It will appear, from the comment itself, how beautifully everything is connected together. The exhortation (vers. 1, 2) can be regarded as a kind of introduction to that which follows immediately; while the Apostle explains farther (vers. 3–7) *how* and (vers. 8–13) *why* he should suffer for the name of Christ.—**Thou therefore, my son.** The contrast to the foregoing is not to be overlooked here. Be the conduct of others as it may, do not allow thyself to be turned from the way thou art upon, but be strong according to the inward man.—**Be strong in the grace**; about equivalent to, *be strong in the Lord and in the power of his might* (Eph. vi. 10). Ἐνδυναμοῦσθαι, to encourage one's self, to strengthen one's self inwardly.—*In* the grace, not only *through* the grace; so that ἐν must be explained as διά; besides, also, that the grace of Christ makes up, as it were, the element of life in which Timothy moves, and from which his strength is born.—**In Christ Jesus**; the grace which dwells in complete fulness in Christ, and in His fellowship becomes the personal possession of believers in Him. If this power first were received and preserved, Timothy would be in a condition to fulfil the demand now following. The more deeply Paul feels that the moment is drawing near when he shall quit the scene of his activity, so much the more, naturally, must it be in his mind to leave behind, in his friend and pupil, a courageous and bold witness of Jesus Christ. To this end he gives him now, before all things, a command (ver. 2) how he must act with the treasure of doctrine which he has received from the Apostle.

Ver. 2. **And the things that thou hast heard of me**, &c. We find no sufficient grounds to think here (Huther, De Wette, and others) of a definite transaction—of which mention is made also in 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6—viz., the ordination of Timothy. We believe much rather (Matthies) that the Apostle is thinking here of his public statements of doctrine, of his own preaching of evangelical doctrine and history, which Timothy must have heard, naturally, often, and which had been made before many witnesses. The correctness of this view appears clear from the fact that Timothy must commit what he has heard to such men as, in their turn, might be in condition *to teach* others also; from which conclusion of the verse we may well infer that the Apostle, in its beginning also, has referred to his doctrine, and not to special official prescripts, which could find application only in the case of individuals. If a connection be sought between this exhortation and the context, whether preceding or following, then it may be said that Timothy must not only himself fight (ver. 3), but must also gird others, and in this way, as a good soldier of

Jesus Christ care for his covenant-comrades (Huther). Perhaps it is still yet simpler, if we consider this exhortation, standing entirely alone, as coming from the Apostle's pen rather without design, and then say: the Apostle does not bind himself to express through the context what is exercising his mind. In ver. 3 he continues the series of reflections already begun, uninterruptedly. "But thus writes no forger—so after a plan, yet so spontaneously," (Wiesinger). Obviously, after what has here been said, the design of the Apostle is now clear. It is not enough for him that Timothy himself preach the truth purely and plainly; he must also have a care that it be transmitted and preserved in its purity and plainness. To this end, all the admonitions occurring here, serve. Timothy has heard the Apostle's word **among many witnesses,** διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων; properly, *intervenientibus multis testibus—under the interposition; i. e.*, here, *in presence* of many witnesses (WINER, *Gramm.*, p. 338). That which he also must transmit is, in a certain respect, no longer a private possession, but has become already common property. This shall he **entrust to faithful men**; and now so much the more, since it is his intention (chap. iv. 19) to quit Ephesus, and to go to Paul. "*Antequam isthinc ad me proficiscare;*" Bengel. By πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις, we do not understand faithful in general (although it is self-evident that this is presupposed), but true, reliable men, who can guard well, and wisely administer the committed trust (comp. 1 Cor. iv. 2, 7, 25).—**Who shall be able.** Not a new quality added to the foregoing, but, as often, οἵτινες in the sense of *quippe qui apti erunt*—**to teach others also**; in other words, to set forth again to others, for their instruction and edification, the gospel which they themselves have first heard. We cannot possibly see here anything else, than that by ἑτέρους we must think of the members of the congregation, and not of teachers. The idea that Timothy—as Paul had done—should gather pupils around him, and that these again should train pupils, so that in the community an order (*stamm*) of apostolic men might continue which could devote itself to the unimpaired transmission of apostolical doctrine (Huther), appears to us to be thrust into the text, and, when clearly and consistently developed, to lead either to the notion of a sort of esoteric doctrine, or to point to the Roman Catholic theory of tradition.—["The things agreed on, and consented to by all the other Apostles, do thou commit to able men, and appoint them as bishops to the several churches under thee;" so Dr. Hammond. "I think there is no foundation for all this in the text;" Whitby, *in loco*.—E. H.]—We avoid this difficulty when we simply so interpret the exhortation, that Timothy should care for the transmission and confirmation of the gospel *in the congregation*, through other qualified teachers (*Lehrorgane*).

Ver. 3. **Thou therefore endure . . . of Jesus Christ.** After what has just been said, the Apostle proceeds farther to the express exhortation to suffer for the cause of the Lord. Συγκακοπάθησον, *suffer with*; the true reading, instead of the *Recepta*, σὺ οὖν κακοπάθησον; which, through the superfluous repetition of the σὺ οὖν (ver. 1), gives a flat, cumbrous sense. The word κακοπαθεῖν (comp. ver. 9, and chap. iv. 5) is also often used, by the classical writers, of the fatigues, burdens, and deprivations which are connected with military service. Under three distinct figures the Apostle now places before Timothy his Christian calling. The first is that of *a soldier*. Serving, as such, under the banner of Jesus, he must feel bound partly to endurance and partly to abstinence. TERTULL., *Ad Martyres, cap* 3, p. 138, Edit. Rigalt: "*Nemo miles ad bellum cum deliciis venit, sed de papilionibus expeditis et substrictis, ubi omnis duritia, imbonitas et insuavitas consistit.*" Also elsewhere, 1 Tim. i. 18; vi. 12; 1 Cor. ix. 7; 2 Cor. x. 4, 5; and especially in Eph. vi. 12-18, is the same figure employed by the Apostle.

Ver. 4. **No man . . . that he may please him that,** &c. As the soldier, especially when in active service—ὁ στρατευόμενος—must bear more than others, so, still farther, has he less freedom than others to do everything he may wish. Ἐμπλέκεται signifies, especially, entanglement in something hindering and obstructing (comp. 2 Peter ii. 20). By πραγματείαι (comp. Luke xix. 13), we must not think exclusively of lawsuits, but especially of business affairs, and generally of all those occupations which the support of daily life renders necessary, but which also are wholly irreconcilable with a faithful fulfilment of the duties of a soldier. Amongst the ancients, the unnatural combination of one line of activity with another was forbidden by positive laws. AMBROS. *De Offic., libr.* 1, says: "*Qui imperatori militat, a susceptionibus litium, actu negotiorum forensicum, venditione mercium prohibetur humanis legibus.*"—"He who fights for the Imperator, is prohibited by human laws from litigation, the pursuit of forensic affairs, the sale of merchandise." [*Militares viros civiles curas arripere prohibemus.* Quoted by Whitby.—E. H.]—The sole calling of the στρατιώτης is that, through the faithful performance of his duties, he please *the commander*, τῷ στρατολογήσαντι; *i. e.*, the commander-in-chief. The Catholic Church (Roman) has interpreted this prescript literally, in that it has forbidden the clergy, peremptorily, a certain number of unclerical occupations (see WALTER's *Kirchenrecht*, 5th ed., Bonn, 1831, p. 398). On the other hand, upon the Protestant side, the following application was characteristically given to this passage by Melanchthon: "*Ita vult ministrum Evangelii totum servire propriæ vocationi et non ingerere se in alienos, in gubernationem politicam. Non habeat minister Evangelii alterum pedem in templo, alterum in curia.*" ("So he wishes the minister of the gospel to serve in his own vocation unreservedly, and not to engage in outside affairs, in political management. Let not the minister of the gospel have one foot in the temple and the other in the *curia.*") If we ask in what way the Apostle himself has, in his own example, explained this his prescript, then it becomes plain that it must be understood not *absolutè*, but *cum grano salis*. Paul also, while working with his hands, has eaten his own bread (Acts xx. 34; 1 Cor. iv. 12; *Ib.*, ix. 6); and certainly he will not have given this counsel to Timothy unconditionally. But, assuredly, special tact and wisdom are necessary so to manage the inevitable cares and occupations which daily life brings with it, that the cause of the kingdom of God shall be thereby in no wise injured, but rather can gain advantage from their results; as was the case actually with Paul himself, who found occasion, in his own activity, to set forth his example to the community for imitation (see 2 Thess. iii. 6-9).

Ver. 5. **And if a man also strive for masteries, yet is he not crowned except he strive lawfully.** The Apostle develops now, yet farther,

the same thought in the form of a *second* figure. *To strive*, is not synonymous here with στρατεύεσθαι, but is an expression borrowed from the Greeks (ἀθλεῖν), to which he alludes also in 1 Cor. ix. 24 and 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8 (comp. Heb. xii. 1). It is not enough, he wishes to say, that a man shall himself only take part in the contest, indifferent how, in other respects, he carries himself; but, chiefly and before all that he conduct himself according to the laws of battle, since without this he can lay no claim to the honor of being crowned. He who fights against the laws of the contest, forfeits his crown; νομίμως ἀθλήσῃ = conformably to the laws. The specific, not tropical sense, is as follows: The minister of the gospel dare not arbitrarily exempt himself from this or that portion of his task, or even direct his activity according to his own discretion; not the bias of his own heart, but the will of the Lord alone must be his standard; so that, without this, it is impossible for him to hope for His approval and recognition.

Ver. 6. **The husbandman that laboreth must be first partaker of the fruits.** The *third* figure, borrowed from the husbandman, develops once more the same idea, though in a measure, indeed, upon another side. Here, too, there is no promise (De Wette), but an exhortation, grounded upon a comparison with the γεωργός. Κοπιῶντα is put forward with emphasis, for a proof that the Apostle is speaking of a privilege which is accorded exclusively to the laboring, but in no wise to the *not*-laboring husbandman. There must be work especially with persistent exertion, if one will—what every husbandman naturally wishes—actually gather the fruits of his field. The question only is, in what sense πρῶτον is to be taken, and with what this adverb is to be combined. Not in the sense of *ita demum* (Heinrichs; also the Dutch translation); as little as an hyperbaton = τὸν γεωργὸν κοπιῶντα πρῶτον, κ.τ.λ.; but that also it be connected with μεταλαμβάνειν, and considered equivalent to *first*, *before all others*. The Apostle will say, finally, not every husbandman, but he only who labors with assiduity, must first, before all others, enjoy the fruits of his labor. If, consequently, Timothy will claim this privilege for himself, there must be unremitting toil upon his part; just as above, in ver. 5, his coronation was made dependent upon lawfully-conducted contests. That, for the teacher, the right of a suitable support upon the part of the community exists, is without doubt a Pauline thought (see 1 Cor. ix. 7, *et seq.*); this, nevertheless, is not taught *here*.

Ver. 7. **Consider what I say, &c.** According to De Wette, this exhortation is apparently superfluous, since the foregoing comparisons were easy for Timothy to understand. "But the sense of the verse is not meant to enlighten the understanding of Timotheus as to the *meaning* of the metaphors, but as to the personal *application* of them;" Conybeare and Howson. Hence, also, it is not necessary to adopt the notion (Mosheim, Michaelis), that some secret sense lies hidden under the foregoing comparisons.—**And the Lord give thee understanding in all things.** This reminder is here all the more appropriate, since an unspiritual understanding of the prescripts of the Apostle, κατὰ ῥητόν, not κατὰ διάνοιαν, was certainly possible, but not desirable for the community. For the rest, these words, although they refer exclusively to the foregoing, make nevertheless an appropriate transition to what follows (vers. 8–13); in which verses the Apostle names various motives which should determine Timothy to the true fulfilment of the duty which hitherto had been pressed upon his heart.

Ver. 8. **Remember that Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, raised from the dead,** &c. First motive: remembrance of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Paul directs the view of his friend and pupil *back* to that great event which is the foundation of all faith and of all hope of Christians (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 12–20). He should hold Jesus Christ in remembrance (here, where there is occasion to speak of the Lord as an *historical* person, not the name of office—Christ—but the individual name—Jesus—stands first), not in general, but here especially the risen from the dead (ἐγηγερμένον, not ἐγερθέντα). Through the addition, *of the seed of David* (comp. Rom. i. 3), not the *lowliness* of the person of the Lord, also not His *Messianic dignity* (Huther), but simply His *human* descent, His origin is denoted, and truly, indeed, with indirect "polemic" against the docetic error of false teachers; and upon this circumstance special stress is laid, because Timothy could perceive from it that Jesus Christ, although man of flesh and blood as he himself, nevertheless was raised from the dead; and this could contribute, amid the feeling of his own weakness, to his consolation and encouragement. "*Hanc unam genealogiam a Timotheo vult attendi, quæ argumento est Jesum esse Christum;*" Bengel. —**According to my gospel** (comp. Rom. ii. 16; xvi. 25; 1 Tim. i. 11). That Paul is thinking here of the gospel of Luke (Jerome, Baur), is wholly unproven. Not without indirect polemic against the preaching of those who do not place the resurrection of the Lord in the forefront, or who reject it decidedly, Paul speaks here so expressly of it, since his train of thought occasions him now, in what follows immediately, to speak of his own person.

Ver. 9. **Wherein I suffer trouble . . . unto bonds.** A *second* motive for Timothy. He should direct his look not only *backwards*, but also *around* him, to the example of his own teacher and fellow-soldier.—*Wherein;* for the sake of which—the gospel—ἐν ᾧ, "*cujus annuntiandi munere defungens;*" Beza.—*I suffer*, κακοπαθῶ (comp. ver. 3).—*Even unto bonds*, μέχρι δεσμῶν. His present bonds are the *ultimus terminus ad quem*, whither his suffering has gone on until now (comp. Phil. ii. 8), μέχρι θανάτου.—**As an evil-doer.** "*Malum passionis, ac si præcessisset malum actionis;*" Bengel. The word κακοῦργος, which occurs besides only in the gospel of Luke (chap. xxiii. 39), sounds very well in the mouth of the Apostle, who had so fine a feeling for honor and shame, just to express the nature of his own position; and this so much the more, since, at the latest, his case had taken an unfavorable turn (comp. chap. iv. 16, 17).—**But the word of God is not bound.** Parenthesis, in which the Apostle gives account of what serves especially for his encouragement amid his heavy sorrows.—*The word of God;* designation of the gospel, specially upon the side of its Divine origin (comp. 1 Thess. ii. 13); not of the Holy Scriptures in general, nor of the Divine promises in particular.—*Is not bound*, οὐ δέδεται. Antithesis to his own imprisoned estate, τρέχει (2 Thess. iii. 1). The gospel is preached in spite of the imprisonment of Paul, not through himself (as De Wette explains, while he appeals for his interpretation to Acts xxviii. 31, for we have to do here with the *second* imprisonment), but through others.

Ver. 10. **Therefore . . . glory.** Διὰ τοῦτο; therefore, because the word of God is not bound. The unimpeded course of the gospel is to the Apostle a new proof of its all-embracing power; and the thought inspires him to suffer willingly for a cause which otherwise might seem lost. The additional clause, **for the elect's sake,** must thence be understood not as a new ground, but as a more definite statement. By the ἐκλεκτοί, we must think here exclusively just as little of those to whom the gospel is not yet preached, as of those who have already received it (comp. Titus i. 1). The conception is rather to be taken generally. For their sakes he endures all. Ὑπομένω denotes not only passive endurance, but steadfastness, as of a soldier on the attack of the enemy (Wiesinger). It is not so evident what the Apostle means thereby, when he adds yet, **that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory.** *They also*, καὶ αὐτοί; as now already the Apostle himself, upon his part, was conscious of the σωτηρία in Christ. It is nevertheless a question, in what way the sorrow of the Apostle could serve to the furtherance of the same end with the ἐκλεκτοί. That he regarded his own suffering as in no way sin-extinguishing, requires indeed no special mention. The view, further also, that he wishes only to express the salutary influence which the consideration of his ὑπομονῇ would exert upon the ἐκλεκτοί (De Wette, Huther), will not fairly satisfy us. Certainly it is better, if we paraphrase his thoughts thus: that he, amid all the burdens of his calling, endured, without yielding up the high task of his life, that thereby the elect of God might be partakers of the σωτηρία in Christ, through his persevering, continued preaching (comp. Acts xiii. 48). This σωτηρία is here united with its highest reach—μετὰ δόξης αἰωνίου. "*Cum gloriâ æternâ. Hoc finis est salutis, quam in Christo consequimur, salus enim nostra est, Deo vivere, quæ incipit a regeneratione nostra, absolvitur autem plena nostra liberatione, quum nos Deus ex mortalis vitæ ærumnis eductos in regnum suum colligit. Ad hanc salutem accedit participatio cœlestis aleoque divinæ gloriæ. Ergo ut Christi gratiam amplificaret, nomen æternæ gloriæ saluti apposuit;*" Calvin.—["With eternal glory. This is the reach of the salvation which we obtain in Christ. For our salvation is to live to God, which begins from our regeneration, but is completed in our full deliverance when God gathers us from the calamities of our mortal life into His kingdom. Participation of heavenly and so of divine glory happens to this salvation. Therefore, that he may magnify the grace of Christ, he adds the name of eternal glory to salvation."]

Ver. 11. **It is a faithful saying, &c.** Finally, the Apostle adduces a *third* motive. He directs the look of Timothy *forward* to the *results* which are connected in the future as well with the faithfulness as with the unfaithfulness of the servant of Christ. *Faithful is the word*, must not, as 1 Tim. iv. 9, be referred to the preceding, but, as 1 Tim. i. 15, to the immediately following. The Apostle strengthens a general thought, and γάρ is equivalent to *indeed*. "The recent interpreters consider the following sentences, corresponding to each other, as strophes from a church hymn, respecting which, again as before, nothing more can be said than that the passage answers thoroughly well for a hymn, but it cannot be proved to have been taken from one;" (Matthies). But if, now, the words do not constitute a portion of an old Christian church song, surely they deserve to be employed as the text of a Christian hymn.—**For if we be dead with (him), we shall also live with (him).** A genuine Pauline thought. It is known how (amongst other places, Rom. vi.) the whole Christian life is comprehended under the category of a dying and rising again with Christ. Not only the outward resemblance, but also the personal fellowship of the Christian with the Lord, is here meant; and, indeed, he speaks of a death and life in a spiritual sense, not in a pure natural sense. Yet the spiritual dying must certainly attain to such height, that we must be prepared, if necessary, to renounce our natural life for the sake of the Redeemer; while, on the other hand, the true spiritual life which is enjoyed here in consequence of that spiritual dying with Him (*mitsterbens*) issues in a personal participation of the blessed life in eternity.

Ver. 12. **If we suffer, we shall also reign with (him).** (Comp. Rom. viii. 17; Eph. ii. 6.) Not suffering wholly in general, but with Him, σὺν αὐτῷ, is here meant. Reigning with Him is somewhat the same with the phrase, "to reign in life" (Rom. v. 17), when, indeed, the Messiah's kingdom shall be revealed in its full glory.—On the other hand, **if we deny (him), he also will deny us.** Perhaps an allusion to the Lord's own words, Matt. x. 33; Mark viii. 38; to which also 2 Peter ii. 1; Jude 4, seem to hint. To deny Christ, is, in general, to be ashamed of Him by word or deed. Here, with special reference to the work of the minister of the gospel, to be ashamed, through fear of men, to confess Him freely. He who is guilty of this, finds his sentence already recorded (Matt. vii. 23).

Ver. 13. **If we believe not,** &c.; not in general, but are unfaithful to our holy calling, and to the vows made before the Lord. That condition is meant, indeed, which constitutes the ground of the denial of the Lord just referred to. "*Si abnegamus; ore, si non credimus: corde;*" Bengel.—**Yet he abideth faithful** (comp. Rom. iii. 3, 4). He will not, as we in like case, become *untrue* to Himself. For **he cannot deny himself** (see Critical remarks). It is a gross misunderstanding to interpret this last reminder as *a word of consolation* in any such sense as this:—if we, from weakness, are unfaithful, we may calm ourselves with the thought that He will not break His word; and that, notwithstanding it, His faithfulness to us will be forever confirmed. In a certain sound sense this thought is certainly true; but the connection of the discourse here plainly shows that the Apostle will warn with emphasis, and, in other words, will say: Fancy not, if thou art unfaithful, that the Lord's punishment will fail. He is just as faithful in His threatenings as in His promises. He remains ever like Himself, and can also just as little endure the unfaithful, as He can allow the faithful to go unrewarded (comp. Heb. ii. 3; John iii. 20).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The prescript of the Apostle in ver. 2 is specially weighty on this account, because a very significant hint is given for the true relation between Scripture and tradition. Certainly it is true that an apostolic *tradition* existed *before* and also apart from the New Testament; so that, in a certain respect, it

can be said that the Church has not to thank Scripture for its origin, but was established independently of it. It was this truth which orthodox Protestant theologians have only too often forgotten, but which has been handled, amongst others, by Lessing, with power and good success. On the other side, it is also equally certain that we would not know and authenticate purely the apostolic tradition, if, early, a *Scripture* had not been at hand, in which it was deposited, and unless this Scripture were the necessary *corrective*, by which all that presents itself to us as tradition must be proved, and also according to which it must become ever modified.* In the gospel of John (chap. xxi. 23), we have the earliest proof in point—how impure tradition already in the earliest age would become, were it not *fastened* in Scripture, and even explained thereby. The publicity which the Apostle here palpably claims for the pure transmission of his original doctrine, stands, moreover, in noticeable contrast over against the veil of the mysterious, in which false teachers frequently envelop their doctrines.

2. As the threefold figure of the soldier, the athlete, and the husbandman, presents to view the calling and the burdens in the life of the minister of the gospel, so also the calling of each individual Christian, at all times and in all places, admits easily its reapplication.

3. The high value which the Apostle attributes to the bodily resurrection of the Lord, here and in other passages, is, in a remarkable way, in contrast with the spiritualistic and indifferentistic evaporization of this chief article of the gospel, on the side of the modern speculative rationalism of our days.

4. "The word of God is not bound." Through this thought, which is applicable in the widest sense, the *peculiarity* of the gospel in opposition to every human institution, even to the law of Moses, is devoted, as well also as its rapid and unhindered *spread* is explained; while its future conquest over every, even the greatest obstacle, is guaranteed.

5. The suffering of the witnesses for Christ was, and is at all times, one of the most powerful agencies for the furtherance of the gospel (comp. Phil. i. 12–14; Col. i. 24; 2 Cor. i. 5–7). "The sorrow as well as the consolation of a minister of the gospel, as of a leader in Christ's contest, extends to other Christians for consolation and welfare. His sorrow, in this, that each suffering for Christ, in and with Christ, is a victory; while persistent strength of faith in fierce battle overcomes sin and the world in them, the spectacle is the consolation of all who behold their conflict, and who fight after them. And while the witnesses for Christ again are consoled, now also, according to the deeper experience of life, a rich source of comfort and power streams forth from them into the hearts of others;" Gerlach.—Compare VINET's beautiful essay upon Col. i. 24: "*Le fidèle achevant les souffrances de Jésus Christ,*" in his *Études Évangéliques*, pp. 112–146.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

What and how the Christian shall suffer for Christ.—The holy calling of the minister of the Lord: (1.) The extent of this calling (vers. 1–7). Presented under figures (*a*) of the soldier, (*b*) the athlete, (*c*) the husbandman; (2.) motives for the exercise of this calling (vers. 8–13): (*a*) a look backwards (ver. 8), (*b*) a look around about one (vers. 9, 10), (*c*) a look forwards (vers. 11–13).—The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ the true strength of His own. —Even the best Christian needs, like Timothy, constant strengthening.—Scripture and tradition.—The worth and the want of worth of tradition.—The Christian teacher a soldier of Christ: (*a*) The enemy against whom, (*b*) the Leader under whom, (*c*) the weapons with which, (*d*) the crown for which he strives.—The inevitable, necessary self-denial which is bound up with the service of the Lord.—What the Christian teacher can learn from the husbandman: (1.) No fruit without labor; (2.) no labor without reward.—Hold in remembrance, that Jesus Christ is risen from the dead: (1.) Why shall this be thought of? This recollection gives power to work, to endurance, to conflict, to dying; (2.) how shall this be thought of? Continually, faithfully (in a believing spirit), in joyful hope.—The word of God is not bound, (1.) to any person who preaches it, (2.) to any form in which it is preached, (3.) to any time, place, or other circumstance.—The suffering of the ministers, the gain of the congregations. —Through dying to life, through enduring to reigning, through denial to being denied.—The thought of the faithfulness of the Lord an inestimable consolation for His own, but likewise a most earnest warning.—The great antithesis and the inner connection between the this-side and the beyond-side in Christian life.—The higher the calling, so much the heavier the responsibility.—He who will win the highest, must also venture the highest.—The faithfulness of the Lord not bound to our unfaithfulness.

STARKE: *Bibl. Würt.*: Christians must not only stand by Divine truth, but they must do their utmost that it be transmitted to posterity, upon which account they should support churches and schools, and should help care for their preservation (2 Thess. iii. 1).—CRAMER: Beautiful evidence of three main articles of the Christian faith: that Christ is true man, born of the seed of David, was really dead, and is really risen from the dead (Luke xxiv. 6, 7).—HEDINGER: The suffering and glory of Christ in common with His members.—It belongs to the mystery of the cross of Christ, that, the more purely any one preaches it, the more persecution, or at least evil report of the doctrine, he experiences on account of it.—QUESNEL: Happy, and eternally glorious, are different.—That God gives eternal life to them who, for the sake of Christ, die the martyr's death, no one doubts; but that every Christian is under obligation to die with Christ through the mortifying of his own pleasures and desires, and to put to death his former sins through the martyrdom of penitence, is not believed, and yet it must be believed just as much as the other.

HEUBNER: God has formed for Himself, out of weak and despised ones, the strongest instruments. —No human power can suppress the word of God, or hinder its course.—No rejected person will be able to complain to the Lord, and say He has not kept His word.

LISCO: What adorns the minister of Christ?—Be faithful even unto death.—The picture of a good soldier of Christ: (1.) His *quality* (vers. 1–7); (2.) his encouragements and strenthenings (vers. 8–13). —Wholly to Christ do we belong in life, suffering, and dying.—Of the conflict and of the crown of the

* [An important principle, well stated.—E. H.]

Christian.—PALMER: The entire pericope, as an admonition to Christians, confirmed.—SCHRÖDER: The confirmation solemnity a farewell solemnity: (1.) What is the *home* we thereby leave? (2.) what is the *strange land* into which we are introduced? (3. what *staff* is thereby given into our hands?—Ver. 8, appropriate especially to the Festival of Easter, or the Sunday following.

V.

Directions to Timothy how he may become further efficient in the preservation of the truth, and in his conflict with error.

CH. II. 14–26.

14 Of these things put *them* in remembrance, charging *them* before the Lord[1]
that they strive not about words[2] to no[3] profit, *but* to the subverting of the
15 hearers. Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth
16 not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. But shun [the] profane
and vain babblings: for they will increase unto more ungodliness [for they will
17 fall into a greater measure of ungodliness]. And their word will eat as doth a
18 canker: of whom is Hymeneus and Philetus; Who concerning the truth have
erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of
19 some. Nevertheless, the foundation of God[4] standeth sure [the firm foundation
of God standeth], having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are His. And,
Let every one that nameth the name of Christ [the Lord][5] depart from iniquity.
20 But in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also
21 of wood and of earth; and some to honour, and some to dishonour. If a man
therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified,[6]
22 and meet for the master's use, *and* prepared unto every good work. Flee also
youthful lusts: but follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, with [all?][7] them
23 that call on the Lord out of a pure heart. But [the] foolish and unlearned ques-
24 tions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes. And the [a] servant of the
Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all *men*, apt to teach, patient [of evil],
25 In meekness[8] instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure
will give them repentance to the acknowledging [in reference to the knowledge]
26 of the truth; And *that* they may recover themselves [awake to soberness] out
of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will.

[1] Ver. 14.—[τοῦ κυρίου; so *Recepta*, Lachmann, Tischendorf. The Sin. has Θεοῦ.—E. H.]

[2] Ver 14.—μὴ λογομαχεῖν, instead of λογομάχει. It is difficult to decide upon the proper reading here. The reader is referred to the critical comment upon the verse. [Lachmann puts a full period after κυρίου, and thus connects the first clause of the sentence with the preceding section. The new section would thus begin with μὴ λογομάχει. I confess to a preference for this latter arrangement, εἰς οὐδ., κ.τ.λ.—E. H.]

[3] Ver. 14.—[The critical editions, and the Sin., read ἐπί.—E. H.]

[4] Ver. 19.—[τ. Θεοῦ. Sin., τ. κυρίου.—E. H.]

[5] Ver. 19.—[A. C. Δ. G., Tischendorf, Lachmann, Cod. Sin., κυρίου instead of Χριστοῦ.—E. H.]

[6] Ver. 21.—The *Recepta* has a connecting καί after ἡγιασμένον, which is omitted properly by the critical editors; omitted also in the Sin.

[7] Ver. 22.—[Lachmann, on the strength of A. C. G., has πάντων after μετὰ.—E. H.]

[8] Ver. 25.—[*Recepta*, πραότητι. Πραΰτητι, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Sin.; in fact, the *Recepta* is entirely exceptional here.—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 14. **Of these things put them in remembrance,** ταῦτα ὑπομίμνησκε. With these words a new part of the Epistle begins, which runs through to the end of this chapter. If the Apostle, in the first half of the second chapter, exhort Timothy to patient *suffering*, now he rouses him to vigorous *action*, and communicates directions to him on the manner and way in which especially he shall act against false teachers. The beginning of the admonition refers back to vers. 11–13, since the recollection of the great judgment in the glorious appearing of the Lord is preëminently fitted to hold any one back from every insignificant strife of words. The question whether the immediately following words, διαμαρτυρόμενος ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου, belong to the preceding, or to the following μὴ λογομαχεῖν, depends upon another, viz., whether the reading here of the *Recepta* be genuine, or whether, with A. C., Vulgat., Ital., Æth., and the Latin church-fathers, we must read λογομάχει; which last reading Lach

mann also has adopted, and Matthies and Huther defended. In this event, the words διαμαρτ. ἐνώπ. τοῦ κυρ. must be referred to ὑπομίμνησκε. We believe, nevertheless, that the usual reading, μὴ λογομαχεῖν, as well on account of the *number* as of the *weight* of the witnesses, deserves the preference, and that this latter was what Timothy should testify to his hearers, ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου. The admonition, not **to strive about words,** was more appropriate and necessary for the surroundings of Timothy, than for Timothy himself. The λογομαχίαι (1 Tim. vi. 4) were much sought after and liked by the heresiarchs of those days, since, through their dexterity in disputation, they endeavored to win for themselves the reputation of deep thinkers and forcible rhetoricians; against which folly, and the obscuration connected with it, the Apostle has already, earlier, declared himself (1 Cor. i. 17). The desire to engage in such controversies could easily enough transfer itself from the false teachers to the congregation, in which event it must feel itself impelled naturally to enter the lists in behalf of some party, and it is in so far forth not necessary to consider this exhortation as directed *exclusively* to a teacher. The reason why Paul opposes this perversion with so great emphasis, appears from what immediately follows: **to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers.** This is also an oppositional addition of an entire proposition, in which the foregoing exhortation is enforced through a more definite statement of the nature and result of the said λογομαχεῖν. It does not breed the slightest advantage (χρήσιμος only here; comp. the ζητήσεις ἀνωφελεῖς κ. μάταιοι, Titus iii. 9), but, on the contrary, direct harm, since it calls forth just the reverse of the desired οἰκοδομή. Καταστροφή = καθαίρεσις (2 Cor. xiii. 10), subversion, perversion, corruption, since in this way only vanity and caprice are awakened, and schism is nourished, which indeed is not the conscious aim, but is, nevertheless, the inevitable result (ἐπί) of the deplorable λογομαχεῖν.

Ver. 15. **Study to . . . which needeth not to be ashamed.** After the Apostle has now pointed out to Timothy the evils he has to contend with in his sphere of action, he tells him what he must, in his own person, seek to accomplish.—*Study*, σπούδασον; be zealously affected thereto. "*Verbum conveniens characteri totius epistolæ;*" Bengel.—**To show thyself approved unto God.** Δόκιμος = *spectatus, probatus;* to be taken here *absolutè*, not to be connected with the following ἐργάτην. Παραστῆσαι τῷ Θεῷ (comp. Rom. vi. 13, 16), not only = εὐάρεστον εἶναι τῷ Θεῷ, but so that he become *manifest* to God as δόκιμος. In what character he must address himself to the service of God, appears from the words which immediately follow: **a workman,** &c. Ἐργάτης, also Phil. iii. 2; 2 Cor. xi. 13, is used of labor in the field of the kingdom of God. Ἀνεπαίσχυντος, he who is not ashamed of His cause (comp. Phil. i. 20; 1 John ii. 28); strictly, *barefaced, impudent;* hence, one who does not expect confusion. "*Cui sua ipsius conscientia nullum pudorem incutiat.*" Others explain: one who, without being ashamed of himself, comes forward freely for the cause of the Lord, as in chap. i. 8, which explanation is less supported by the context than the foregoing.—**Rightly dividing the word of truth.** A more precise designation of the laborer "approved unto God," which has made much trouble for the interpreters of every age. The word of truth can be, naturally, nothing else than the gospel which Timothy preached. Ὀρθοτομεῖν, *recte secare;* strictly, to cut in the true direction. In respect, now, of the question in how far this conception can be applied to the λόγος τῆς ἀληθείας, we must certainly agree with De Wette, when he says that, without proof from usage, men have had in their minds the dissection of an animal offered in sacrifice, or of the cutting up of bread upon the part of the οἰκόνομος. His own view, however, that the metaphor is borrowed originally from ploughing, admits just as little of satisfactory proof as the other supposition, that the figure is taken from the work of the carpenter (Conybeare and Howson). It was likewise entirely arbitrary when certain church-fathers (Chrysostom, Œcumenius, Theophylact) were pleased to have thought of the cutting off of what was foreign, or of false teachers; and, least of all, is there any ground here (Calovius, Olshausen) for supposing that the correct distinction between the law and the gospel is enjoined. If we weigh all maturely, De Wette's interpretation will, in the end, have the most in its behalf (comp. καινοτομεῖν, *nova via incedere*). As the farmer, when he cuts crooked furrows, injures his field, so also the minister of the word, who does not rightly deal with it. That also which Paul here desires of Timothy, is just the reverse of the καπηλεύειν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ (Gal. ii. 14; 2 Cor. ii. 17); and the old church-fathers were in so far forth right when they used, now and then, ὀρθοτομία in the sense of ὀρθοδοξία. In any event, there is here an opposition to *heterodidaskalia*, no prescript for the practical conduct of Timothy, which must be wholly adjusted to the word of God.

Ver. 16. **But shun . . . unto more ungodliness.** Of profane, empty chattering (see Observ. on 1 Tim. vi. 20).—*Shun*, περιΐστασο, *avoid;* strictly, *go out of the way of* (comp. Titus iii. 9). Why we must go out of the way of this, the immediately following phrase shows: **for they will increase unto more [fall into a greater measure of] ungodliness.** Ἀσεβείας is to be understood here as genitive, dependent upon ἐπὶ πλεῖον; and the entire expression is to be considered not merely a warning, but also a prophecy, as chap. iii. 13. The Apostle speaks of error itself, not of loose babbling (Luther), and especially shows how apparently pure theoretic error has nevertheless a pernicious practical tendency.

Ver. 17. **And their word will eat as doth a canker.** "The blessed Luther has translated γάγγραινα by cancer (*Krebs*), but it signifies a still more miserable evil; because he who is afflicted with cancer can still nevertheless preserve his life from ten to twenty years; but he who is smitten with gangrene dies in a few hours, if the limb wherein the disease is be forthwith not cut off; for it deprives one limb after another of life and sensation, through the entire body. The Greeks call this disease, usually, σφάκελος, and amongst us it is named gangrene" (*kalte Brand*); Starke. The *tertium comparationis* is the extensive and intensive spread of the disease in the body of the entire congregation. Jerome, in the Commentary upon the Epistle to the Galatians: "*Doctrina perversa ab uno incipiens, vix duos aut tres primum in exordio auditores invenit, sed paulatim cancer serpit in corpore.*"—**Hymeneus and Philetus.** ["That these two were Gnostic teachers, none of the ancients do insinuate; nor did the Gnostics teach that the 'resurrection was past already,' but that the flesh was not fit to rise," &c.; Whitby. We should be

cautious in making assertions about Gnosticism in the apostolic age. The Gnostic temper was in being then, but how much of it had come to the surface under a distinctly *Christian form* is still an obscure matter. Cf. GIBBON, vol. i., chap. 15; BAUR, *Christliche Gnosis*, p. 36 *sqq.*—E. H.] Hymeneus, mentioned also in 1 Tim. i. 20, remained in his error; the other (an ordinary *nomen proprium*, see Wetstein on the place) is not known farther.

Ver. 18. **Who concerning the truth have erred,** *οἵτινες περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἠστόχησαν*; literally, who, in respect of the truth, have missed the way (De Wette); comp. 1 Tim. vi. 21 (*ἀστοχεῖν*; strictly, to lose or miss the good). Wherein the core of their error consisted, the Apostle states in the words: **saying that the resurrection is past already.** *The resurrection* can only be the resurrection of the dead bodies, which Paul, upon the ground of our Lord's own words (John v. 28, 29), teaches us to expect at the end of the present dispensation, simultaneously with the personal *parousia* of the Lord (see 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54; 1 Thess. iv. 13–18). It is also in the meanwhile evident, from 1 Cor. xv. 12, that already, very early, in the congregation, there were persons to whom this apostolic doctrine was offensive, and who either denied it, or, through a false spiritualism, avoided it. The view (Baur) is consequently wholly superfluous,* that there is here a pointed reference to Marcion, which, in that case, still further, would be a proof against the genuineness of the Epistle. In so far as we can learn the very earliest Gnosticism from the genuine Epistles of Paul, the view contains nothing improbable that already in the Apostle's time, at Ephesus and other places, false teachers appeared, who understood, what the gospel teaches of a resurrection in the *specific* sense, of a *spiritual* resurrection to some higher gnosis, or also to a new life in fellowship with Christ, and misapplied perhaps even expressions of the Apostle, as Rom. vi. 3; Eph. ii. 6, and other passages, for the purpose. They found, indeed, amongst the Essenes and Therapeutæ, and still more amongst the Sadducees, manifold points of contact, and they stood, through their morbid idealism, in principial opposition to the healthy and vigorous realism of the apostolic preaching [*Predigt* = *κήρυγμα*, the thing preached.—E. H.], while they also **overthrow the faith of some.** The hope of the future resurrection was indeed an essential factor of the Christian faith, and Paul always laid the greatest stress upon it (comp., *e. g.*, Acts xxiv. 15). The denial of the future resurrection must also lead to a perversion of the fact of the resurrection of Christ, which had already taken place, and shake to its foundations the whole fabric of the Christian faith (*ἀνατρέπειν*, Vulg., *labefactare*), especially amongst the *ἀμαθεῖς* and *ἀστήρικτοι*, of whom there is mention in 2 Peter iii. 16.†

Ver. 19. **Nevertheless, the foundation of God,** &c. "*Paulus ingressus in hanc tristem commemorationem de dissipationibus Ecclesiæ, opponit consolationes duas, alteram publicam, alteram pertinentem ad singulos;*" Melanchthon. It is as if the Apostle were feeling the need of encouraging himself, together with Timothy, with a *nevertheless*, like that of Asaph (Ps. lxxiii. 1). *The firm foundation of God, however* (*ὁ μέντοι στερεὸς θεμέλιος τοῦ Θεοῦ*), the hard foundation-stone, the firm foundation laid by God Himself. It is incorrect to maintain that *θεμέλιος* here = *οἰκία*; rather, the foundation of the building must be understood, although with the firmness of the foundation, the firmness likewise of the building itself is secured. Apparently the Apostle here refers to the latter, and one can in so far forth say that the *θεμέλιος τοῦ Θεοῦ* denotes nothing else than the congregation founded by God Himself. "But Paul designates this as *θεμέλιος*, not because this expression means in itself a building, but in so far as the congregation, as it has been established originally by God, forms only the substructure of the edifice, which is to be gradually completed;" Huther. So all becomes intelligible enough; and it is just as useless as it is arbitrary to think here, by *θεμέλιος*, of believers in general (Chrysostom), or of the entire evangelical truth (Theodoret), or of the doctrine of the resurrection (Michaelis, Ernesti), or of the decree of election (Calvin), or of the Divine promises (Ambrose), or, in a word, of anything for which the connection, as well as the literal meaning of the words, gives a support equally feeble.—**Standeth sure.** *Ἕστηκεν*, notwithstanding, and in spite of all human efforts to shake or to destroy the building of God.—**Having this seal,** *Ἔχων τὴν σφραγῖδα ταύτην*. From the remote ages, it was the custom to place inscriptions upon door-posts, as well also as upon corner-stones (comp. Deut. vi. 9; xi. 20; Rev. xxi. 14). In other passages, also, the Apostle uses the word *σφραγίς* in a metaphorical sense; *e. g.*, Rom. iv. 11; 1 Cor. ix. 2; Eph. i. 10. Here, by the same word, a superscription is signified which stands legible on the *λιθ. θεμέλ.*, whereby the peculiarity of the house of God built thereupon is expressed, and also security for its imperishable continuance is given. The superscription is twofold (*symbolum*)—perhaps with reference to the two sides of the seal, each of which is furnished with a special motto. The first, **The Lord knoweth them that are his**, by the judgment of most interpreters, an allusion to Num. xvi. 5, LXX: *Ἔγνω κύριος τοὺς ὄντας αὐτοῦ.* More probably, however, it is a reminiscence of the word of the good Shepherd (John x. 14).—**And, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ [the Lord] depart from iniquity.** The second side; according to some, an allusion to Num. xvi. 26, or to Isa. lii. 11. A thought so simple and clear requires no searching, however, after an Old Testament sympathetic chord. *To name* the name of the Lord is not precisely the same *as to call* upon this name for salvation (*Seligkeit* = blessedness) (Acts ii. 21), but it means, *to confess* this name as that of Christ, the Lord (comp. 1 Cor. xii. 3). The invocation of this name is completely inseparable from a renunciation of unrighteousness, which, of itself, banishes the sinner from the kingdom of God (Mark vii. 23). *Ἀδικία* includes also here the doctrine of the false teachers, in so far as this of itself leads to *ἀσέβεια* (see ver. 18). The obverse side of the inscription refers also to the highest *consolation* of the faithful (Bengel: "*Novit amanter, nec nosse desinit, sed perpetuo servat suos*"), the reverse side to their holy *calling;* while the union of the two pithy sentences shows that in this way the immovable firmness of the building of God, both upon the part of God and also of men, is secured perfectly

* [Baur liked to find support for his theory of a later date for the composition of some of the Epistles (this amongst the rest) in such allusions and hints, often entirely without reason.—E. H.]

† [Probably the two errors which our expositor here names as separate explanations of this passage should be united.—W.]

Since the Lord knows indeed them that are His, so also, in point of fact, He distinguishes them from those who do not belong to Him, and will never permit Himself to make any mistake through the mere outside of these latter. If every one who names His holy name must depart from all unrighteousness, then sin can never succeed, even when it has already crept into the temple of the Lord, in destroying it wholly. A building which demands holiness, carries within itself no ground of dissolution and overthrow.

Ver. 20. **But in a great house,** &c. To the question whether, by the *great* house, we are to think here of the whole world, or in particular of the Christian Church, Calvin returns the proper answer: "*Non convenit inter interpretes, an domus magna Ecclesiam solam, an totum mundum significet. Ac contextus quidem huc potius nos ducit, ut de Ecclesia intelligamus; neque enim de extraneis disputat Paulus, sed de ipsa Dei familia. Quod tamen pronuntiat, generaliter verum est, adeoque aliter ab eodem Apostolo ad totum mundum extenditur.*"—["It is not settled amongst interpreters whether 'great house' signifies the Church only, or the entire world. And the context indeed leads us rather to understand it of the Church. For Paul is not discoursing of outside matters, but of the family of God itself. Nevertheless, what he declares is true generally, and so elsewhere by the same Apostle is applied to the whole world"] (Rom. ix. 21). He expected, apparently, from Timothy, the not unnatural objection as to why evil, if only here in time, is permitted generally within the temple of God, and is not rather at once wholly cast forth from it. In the way of answer, Paul refers to the fact, that with the comparatively large extension of this building, it cannot well be otherwise than in other great houses; in other words, that in a community so numerous in membership, significant moral diversity amongst its individual members must necessarily exist. There is no reason for thinking here exclusively of the ministers of the congregation, since, rather, what is here said can be equally well applied to its members. By **vessels of gold and of silver,** we may understand the true, the faithful, the eminent teachers and members of the congregation; by vessels **of wood and of earth,** not the less distinguished, yet who, at the same time, are ever upright believers (it is not necessary to purify the house of such, ver. 21), but mere Christians in name, and false teachers; in other words, those who are represented, in the well-known parable of the Lord (Matt. xiii.), as the tares among the wheat, as the worthless fish in the net. The first-named vessels are to honor, the last to dishonor; not of the house nor of the proprietor, but only in respect of themselves, in so far as they subserve an honorable or an ignominious *use*. The Apostle says besides, moreover, in Rom. ix. 21, that they have been ἡτοιμασμένα thereto. In both these classes, as is manifest from the diverse materials here named, there are *gradations*, whereby before all it must not be overlooked that the first are made of imperishable, noble metal, the latter, on the other hand, of fragile wood or earthen ware, and are not designed for enduring, but only for *temporary* use, after which they are cast aside. How often the visible Church is compared by Paul to a building, is known (comp. upon 1 Tim. iii. 15).

Ver. 21. **If a man therefore purge himself,** &c. "*Hæc mundatio non est desertio congregationis, sed conversio ad Deum;*" Melanchthon. The inward separation from the evil is here denoted, without which there can be no moral purification (comp. 1 Cor. v. 7).—**From these,** can only refer to those *persons* in the congregation whom the Apostle, in the preceding verse, has described under the figurative expression, "vessels of wood and earth." The breaking away of all fellowship with these was the first requisite, if one would reach the high ideal of Christian life set forth in the words that follow.—**He shall be a vessel unto honor;** consequently, an ornament of the house of God, a living member of the congregation, like the good wheat in the field and the good fish in the net. The hint here given applies, first of all, to Timothy, but then also, in a wider sense, to all the members of the congregation.—**Sanctified**—as belonging to the Lord—**(and) meet for the Master's use** [without the intervening *and* (καὶ); see the critical remark]. Εὔχρηστος, here, as in chap. iv. 11 and Phil. 11, good to use, fitted *directly* for the service of the Master, for whose use, indeed, the others also—the vessels of wood and earth—serve, but are nevertheless prepared only indirectly and temporarily for the purpose.—**Prepared unto every good work** (comp. Eph. ii. 10). Prepared for every kind of useful service, and also not worthless and unfruitful on the day of the coming of Christ (2 Peter i. 8, 10).

Ver. 22. **Flee also youthful lusts.** Would Timothy be a vessel unto honor, then he must not only purify himself from the corruption *without* (*i. e.*, outside of) him, but must do battle also *inwardly* with that which was impure within him. In this way this exhortation hangs together with the foregoing context, without any violence. The *youthful lusts* (Vulg., *juvenilia desideria*) do not consist, as some are pleased to fancy, in a search after novelty, or in a propensity to think out new doctrines, or to secure approbation for them (νεωτερίζειν, *res novas moliri*)—an explanation which is just as little called for, through the context, as through the needs of Timothy—but, as this appears also from the antithesis which immediately follows, we must think here of those lusts which usually make themselves felt especially in youth; not merely of πορνεία, but more, in a general way (Ambrose), of the *voluptates mundanæ*, by which, for the most part, we are seduced in the first half of our lifetime, to which, also, inordinate enjoyment of the senses and an idle honor belong.—**But follow** (comp. 1 Tim. vi. 11) **righteousness, faith, charity, peace** ("inward fellowship and concord;" De Wette) **with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart.** The words *with them* do not refer to the earlier δίωκε, but to the immediately preceding εἰρήνην. Timothy ought to keep this peace with all who call upon the name of the Lord—a qualification of believers, like that given in 1 Cor. i. 2. The calling upon the name of the Lord is also mentioned in Acts ii. 21; *Ib.* ix. 14; Rom. x. 12, as the peculiarity of the confession of Christ.—**Out of a pure heart;** contrast with the heretical teachers, to whom this was wanting (comp. 1 Tim. i. 5). A genuine Christian catholicity, which is also enjoined upon Timothy, over against all separatistic exclusiveness (*sonderwesen*). The more decidedly he must take his stand against certain persons, for the sake of the Lord, so much the more shall he attach himself towards others, with whom he feels united in the great cause.

Ver. 23. **But the foolish and unlearned questions avoid** (comp. 1 Tim. i. 14; vi. 4). Here also the ζητήσεις are the peculiar mark of the heretical

teachers. They are *foolish*, μωραὶ (comp. Titus iii. 9), since they are in themselves groundless and weak, and are useless (comp. 2 Tim. iii. 16, where the reverse is maintained of the Holy Scriptures); properly, *uneducated*, *uninstructed;* hence, *inapt*, *insipidus*, and, in consequence of this, unfit also to accomplish any good; yea, as appears from what follows, engendering not little evil.—**Knowing that they do gender strifes.** Forth from the egoistic impulse which lies at the bottom of such ζητήσεις, necessarily spring, sooner or later, μάχαι. Calvin: "*Ne ergo nos placendi ambitio ad captandum ex tali ostentatione gratiam sollicitet, semper nobis occurrat hoc Pauli elogium, quæ in maximo pretio hebentur quæstiones, esse tam insulsas eo, quod sint infructuosæ. Deinde malum etiam, quod parere solent, exprimit, nec aliud dicit, quam quod experimur quotidie, eas scilicet jurgandi et digladiandi præbere materiem.*"—["Lest the ambition, therefore, of pleasing seduce us to the winning of grace by such ostentation, this saying of Paul often occurs to us, that questions which are held in the highest estimation are senseless because they are unfruitful. Thus he expresses also the evil which they are accustomed to bring to light, nor does he say anything else than what we daily experience, viz., that they furnish material for jangling and quarrelling."]

Ver. 24. **And the servant of the Lord must not strive.** Everything which causes strife and contention is, precisely upon that account, in contradiction with the calling of a minister of Christ, who strives not nor cries—whose crying must not be heard in the streets (Matt. xii. 19, 20). We scarcely need a reminder that the Apostle does not forbid all, but only useless and ignoble strife, all actual *wrangling*, upon the part of the minister of the gospel (Luther, short of the mark: Shall not *be quarrelsome*).—**But be gentle unto all (men);** ἤπιος, mild, gentle, benevolent, and affectionate, emphatically, towards *all;* not alone towards his associates in the faith, but towards those with whom he comes in contact.—**Apt to teach,** διδακτικός. Not only apt, but always ready to teach all who are willing to receive instruction from him.—**Patient [of evil],** ἀνεξίκακος; *tolerans malorum* (comp. Book of Wisdom, chap. ii. 19). It is not used here in respect of troubles generally, but for the designation of patience under every opposition, upon the part of men, as is clear from what follows immediately.

Ver. 25. **In meekness.** A farther exposition of the manner and way in which Timothy should exhibit the temper just enjoined. *In meekness*, ἐν πραότητι; incorrectly joined by Luther to the preceding verse.—**Instructing those that oppose themselves.** The ἀντιδιατιθέμενοι here designated are, naturally, no personal opponents of Timothy; not, farther, unbelievers in general, but the false teachers who, principially and diametrically, resisted the pure doctrine of the Apostle, together, perhaps, with such members of the congregation as were led away through them. These must he teach, and, by this teaching, ascertain **if God peradventure will give them repentance.** The conversion of those in the opposition (*Widersacher*) should be also the supreme object of his teaching; an object the attainment of which is in the highest degree difficult, but not in any way hopeless. God must effect this conversion (*non est enim opis humanæ: motivum patientiæ;*" Bengel), and it first leads **to the acknowledging [knowledge] of the truth,** ἐπίγνωσις; here also, as in Titus i. 1, *plena et accurata cognitio.* As ἀδικία is the deepest ground of their error, so also is μετάνοια the indispensably necessary requisite in order to the attainment of a genuine ἐπίγνωσις. How desirable it is that such a μετάνοια fail not, the Apostle states in the concluding verse.

Ver. 26. **And (that) they may recover themselves,** &c. Immediate result of the conversion wrought by God. Ἀνανήφειν, to become cool again, to awaken out of a drunken fit, to come to one's senses again.—**Out of the snare of the devil,** ἐκ τῆς παγίδος; *constructio prægnans*, καὶ ῥυσθῶσιν might be supplied. Here also, as in Eph. iv. 27; vi. 11, the devil is represented as an author of evil: in his snares (παγίδες), *i. e.*, by his enticements, are the false teachers not only led captive, but also delivered over into slumber. They have also a twofold need—to be awakened, and to be delivered.—**Taken captive by him,** ἐζωγρημένοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ; made prisoners alive by him; *i. e.*, the devil. Designation of their actual moral condition.—**At his will,** εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα. In the judgment of some, this is spoken of the will of God; according to others, of that of *Satan.* The latter, indeed, is the most probable, judging according to the entire connection; and ἐκείνου can very well refer to the same subject as αὐτοῦ (see De Wette). The captives here referred to are also ensnared through Satan *to do his will; ad illius, sc. seductoris tyranni voluntatem peragendum.* Just this thought of the unhappy fate of those "that oppose themselves" should dispose one to the gentleness enjoined in vers. 24, 25, which otherwise is difficult enough.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. To the duty rightly to divide the word of truth, belongs, in the broader sense of the word, not only the representation of the truth in the form most appropriate thereto, but likewise a representation and development of its contents, which is directed and sustained by the Spirit of Truth in all particulars. "*Nihil prætermittere, quod dicendum sit, nil adjicere de suo, nil mutilare, discerpere, torquere, deinde diligenter spectare, quid ferat auditorum captus, quidquid denique ad ædificationum conducat;*" Beza.

2. The rapid growth of evil, and the slow progress of good, as the experience of all centuries in the history of the kingdom of God shows, is a convincing proof of the inner untruth of Pelagianism.

3. The denial of the resurrection can be made under manifold forms, and its apparent force is partly founded in the fact, that the proper distinction is not made between *resurrectio carnis et corporis.* [This is a pregnant suggestion for American preachers.—E. H.] The declaration of Paul (1 Cor. xv. 50) should just as little be thrown into the shade as the promise (in vers. 53, 54). This denial, however, is always conjoined with a misconception of the great truth which is the key to the entire biblical eschatology. — Bodily form (*Leiblichkeit* = bodiliness = that of which body can be predicated) is the scope of God's ways. [A saying of Oetinger.—P. S.]

4. Paul is just as far removed from a narrow-hearted separation as from an unchristian syncretism. No outward separation, but an inward purification from everything which is perverted in the visible

congregation of the Lord, is here also his motto. As strongly as he declares himself against all false and violent union with those of whom we are convinced that they do not build on the same foundation with ourselves, he is equally decided against the donatistic effort to erect a perfected separatistic church, and so to cut off all the tares, as if the field were already the granary. [It is surprising how this patent teaching of the Bible is still obscured.—E. H.]

5. It is a proof of the profound wisdom of the Apostle, in teaching, that he enjoins upon Timothy no high, rare virtues, for the exercise of which opportunity presents itself only extremely rarely, but precisely such as can be required also of the least important disciples of the Lord, and which can come anew daily into exercise. "Never should a minister of the Lord allow himself to be betrayed to neglect or to despise these simple attributes of an ordinary Christian, for the sake of other pretended excellences."

6. The often diversely answered question, in how far the carrying on of controversy is permissible in the minister of the gospel, is here set forth in its true light by the Apostle (vers. 2, 3 *et seq.*). If our love be true, *i. e.*, a *holy* love, it is impossible for it to preserve an indifferent bearing over against error and sin; and Augustine is right in his saying: "*Melius est cum servitate diligere quam cum lenitate decipere.*" On the other side, we must distinguish clearly between persons and things, and our sympathy become aroused, just through reflection upon the unhappy condition of the erring. Hence, he who cannot bear calmly and reply with dignity to contradiction, is just as little fitted for the ministry of the gospel, as the physician would be for his profession who would allow himself to become moved by the abusive speech of a patient in fever-delirium, either to forsake the sick-bed, or to hurl back the abuse.

7. The minister of the gospel must not be afraid of the conflict with the wisdom of the world. That is a great expression of Gregory the Great, viz.: "*Deus primo collegit indoctos, postmodum philosophos, nec per oratores docuit piscatores, sed per piscatores subegit oratores.*"—["God first gathered the unlearned, afterwards philosophers; nor has He taught fishermen by orators, but has subdued orators by fishermen."—E. H.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Not a strife about words, but a strife about principles, is the true strife in the sphere of God's kingdom.—The Christian principle of utility as the measure of everything which shall or shall not be defended.—As much as a man is before God, so much is he really and truly.—Preach also that thou mayest please God (a very noble homiletical principle of Theremin).—Not only the wheat, but tares also must grow.—The denial of the resurrection an unchristian error.—Error is manifold, truth but one.—The rule of Frederic the Great: Let every one get to heaven *à sa façon*.—Before the tribunal of Paul the Great.—The divine structure of the Church: (1.) The architect; (2.) the foundation; (3.) the inscription.—Grounds of tranquillity amid the attacks with which the divine structure of the Church is threatened: (1.) It is a building of God; (2.) the Lord knoweth them that are His; (3.) let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.—The temporary union of true believers and of nominal Christians in the same community: (1.) An original fact; (2.) an invaluable benefit; (3.) an earnest alarm-voice for both.—Every separatistic impulse a precipitate anticipation of the final separation in the future.—The Christian should be just as little indifferent as impatient of the tares in the field.—The value of the fellowship of the saints in the days of increasing strife.—Avoiding and seeking united in the same life.—Our Christianity cannot be simple and practical enough.—In how far the minister of the gospel may strive, and in how far he may not.—He who will be anything to many, must wish to be all things to all.—Conversion of *the heart*, the way to a purer illumination of the *understanding*.—God bestows conversion, yet not without instruments (means); without our merit, but not without our coöperation.—The demonic background of much apparently very profound error.—Sight of the unhappiness of many opposers of the truth must move us to so much the deeper sympathy with their perversities.

STARKE: CRAMER: A preacher must often repeat an exhortation, because we dwell in a land of forgetfulness.—HEDINGER: We should distinguish well between doctrine and people. All kinds of food are not suited to every one. What is best, can become poison through a hurtful misuse upon the part of the hearer. Alas! that through much confusion upon this point, the ministry of the word must become to many a savor of death.—Skill in disputation is useful in the preservation of the truth; but it becomes misapplied in the palliation of lies (Prov. xxii. 24, 25; 2 Kings xxi. 9, 11).—CRAMER: The doctrine against the resurrection is the way to more errors, yea, to the greatest evils.—Every age has, usually, its special defects, to which before all others it is inclined.—Towards erring opponents of the truth, we must use patience and gentleness, just as towards the drunken and the insane (chap. ii. 24).

HEUBNER: Strife and contention must be hated by the Christian.—The opinion of Hymeneus and Philetus is pernicious: (1.) If the body in itself be the source of evil, then evil is not the guilt of free will: (2.) if the dead do not rise, the resurrection of Christ, and (3.) all resurrection, and all immortality are uncertain.—The virtues which Timothy should desire are just those which are over against youthful failings.—LISCO: In the Church of Christ there is a mixture.—The right preaching of the gospel: (1.) That from which it keeps itself free (vers. 16–18); (2.) that upon which it lays emphasis (vers. 19–21); (3.) that by which it is sustained (vers. 22–26).—In what does the glory of the temple of God consist?

VI.

Prophecy of grievous times, and warning against dangerous, false teachers.

Ch. III. 1–9.

1, 2 This know[1] also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For
men[2] shall [will] be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud,
3 blasphemous, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy. Without natural affec-
tion,[3] truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are
4 good, Traitors, heady, high-minded [puffed up?] lovers of pleasures more than
5 lovers of God; [,] Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof:
6 from such turn away. For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and
7 lead captive[4] silly women[5] laden with sins, led away with divers lusts; Ever
8 learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. Now as
Jannes and Jambres[6] withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth: men
9 of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith. But they shall proceed no
further: for their folly shall be manifest unto all *men*, as theirs also was.

[1] Ver. 1.—[*γίνωσκε*. *γινώσκετε* is the reading adopted by Lachmann, after A. G. Huther inclines to this. The usual reading is retained by Tischendorf, is in the Sin., and is defended by our author.—E. H.]
[2] Ver. 2.—[Cod. Sin. omits the article before *ἄνθρωποι*.—E. H.]
[3] Ver. 3.—[*ἄστοργοι*; omitted in Cod. Sin.—E. H.]
[4] Ver. 6.—[*αἰχμαλωτεύοντες*. The weight of authority is in favor of *αἰχμαλωτίζοντες*, adopted by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Huther, Wordsworth, &c.—E. H.]
[5] Ver. 6.—The article *τὰ* of the *Recepta* is not genuine.
[6] Ver. 8.—[Vulg., *Mambres*.—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **This know also** (comp. 1 Tim. iv. 1). The Apostle passes on now to a new part of his Epistle, which proceeds regularly on to chap. iv. 5. Just as, in the first chapter, he directed a glance over Timothy's past life, and, in the second chapter, communicated to him weighty hints and doctrines for the present, so now he turns towards the future, while at the same time he once yet again enjoins upon him, for his consideration, the admonitions already given, through reference to the speedy approach of troublous times. As in 1 Tim. iv. 1, he had foretold in what style the falling away from the *faith* would reveal itself, so now he announces the outward *immorality* which would be coupled with this falling away, notwithstanding the preservation of the Christian name and of Christian forms. What the Apostle here communicates is not a mere subjective supposition, but wholly, as in 1 Tim. iv. 1, the fruit of a revelation of the Spirit.—**In the last days,** *ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις*. Not a statement, in a general way, of the Christian era, as, *e. g.*, Acts ii. 17; Heb. i. 1, but in particular of the last days of this era, which precede immediately the last, personal Parousia of the Lord (1 Peter i. 5; 2 Peter iii. 3). The Apostle also directs the attention of Timothy expressly to a world-period still future, the germs of which, nevertheless, were then visible (see vers. 6, 9), though it must not be forgotten that he expected the return of the Lord as nigh at hand.—**Perilous times shall come,** *ἐνστήσονται*; not = *imminebunt*, but = *aderunt*, days of which the word (Eph. v. 16), "*Ubi vix reperias, quid agas,*" shall be applicable in full force.

Ver. 2. **For men shall be,** &c. Such men as the Apostle here describes, there have been at all times, and the Apostle does not say that they will be then such for the first time, nor that all men without exception shall be such, but he describes (*exceptis excipiendis*) the moral-spiritual physiognomy of the times which he beholds approaching, in which the beneficent influence of the gospel upon the heart, the household, and the daily life will be less seen than in the apostolic age.—**Lovers of their own selves,** *φίλαυτοι* (*ἅπαξ λεγόμ.*). Original cause of all wickedness, so that they make their own I the centre of their thinking, feeling, willing, and doing.—**Covetous,** *φιλάργυροι*; wholly like the Pharisees (Luke xvi. 14; comp. 1 Tim. iii. 3).—**Boasters,** *ἀλάζονες*; noisy self-assertors, like criers in the markets, who rove about everywhere. Ambrose, *insolentes*.—**Proud,** *ὑπερήφανοι*; who not only plume themselves at all times upon their own advantages, but also look down contemptuously upon others.—**Blasphemers,** *βλάσφημοι* (1 Tim. i. 13); used specially in reference to God, employed here more generally.—**Disobedient to parents** (comp. Rom. i. 30), where, in like manner, several of the corruptions here named are stated. The rejection of lawful authority is also, in Jude 8, a distinguishing trait of the antichristian way of doing, and is here, moreover, adduced as the source of the sins now to be mentioned.—**Unthankful,** *ἀχάριστοι*; men who will know nothing of thanks for heavenly or for earthly benefits (comp. 1 Tim. i. 9; Luke vi. 35).—**Unholy,** *ἀνόσιοι*; profane, irreligious, to whom nothing holy is holy.

Ver. 3. **Without natural affection,** *ἄστοργοι*; not only *sine affectione* (Vulg.), but *sine affectione naturali* (comp. Rom. i. 31).—**Truce-breakers,** *ἄσπονδοι*; "as well those who will make no com

pact, as those also who do not hold to a compact they have made—breakers of agreements;" Huther. —**False accusers,** διάβολοι (1 Tim. iii. 11; Titus ii. 3).—**Incontinent,** ἀκρατεῖς; who cannot control themselves (comp. 1 Cor. vii. 5).—**Fierce,** ἀνήμεροι; untamed, wild.—**Despisers of those that are good,** ἀφιλάγαθοι; for the opposite, see Titus i. 8. Ἐχθροὶ παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ; Theophylact.

Ver. 4. **Traitors,** προδόται; not openly (which would conflict with ver. 5), but men with whom neither truthfulness nor faith is found.—**Heady,** προπετεῖς; rash, fickle (Acts xix. 36), men under the influence of their prejudices, who do not act according to high principles, but by the pressure of circumstances.—**High-minded,** τετυφωμένοι (comp. 1 Tim. iii. 6; vi. 4), beclouded wholly through vain self-delusion.—**Lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God,** φιλήδονοι μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόθεοι; who pursue pleasure more than they ask after God (comp. 1 John ii. 15; Rom. xvi. 18; Phil. iii. 18).

Ver. 5. **Having a form of godliness,** ἔχοντες μόρφωσιν εὐσεβείας. Μόρφωσις stands here as antithesis to substance (Wiesinger); and also, observing, in thorough pharisaic style, the forms of the service of God with the neglect of the essence of the thing.—**But denying the power thereof** (viz., τ. εὐσεβείας), τὴν δὲ δύναμιν αὐτῆς ἠρνημένοι; so that they not only miss the power of godliness, but wilfully reject it (comp. the delineation of false prophets, Matt. vii. 15–20). With these last traits, in a measure the summary of all the preceding, into which they resolve themselves as into a higher unity, the Apostle ends this large register of sins.—**From such turn away,** καὶ τούτους ἀποτρέπου. He says, therefore, without any qualification, Ἀποτρέπεσθαι; occurring here only = ἐκτρέπεσθαι, *aversari* (1 Tim. vi. 20). When we compare this unqualified admonition with the requisition to gentleness which is given in chap. ii. 24–26, in respect of the erring, it becomes clear that the Apostle had in his mind *there* entirely different men from those *here*. But if one ask how he could warn against such men with so great assurance, it becomes obvious, from ver. 6, that he already recognized their πρόδρομοι and spiritual kith in the immediate neighborhood of Timothy.

Ver. 6. **For of this sort,** &c. Such will these persons be, *for* that can be seen from their forerunners already at hand.—**Which creep into houses,** ἐνδύνοντες εἰς τὰς οἰκίας. It is known within what narrow limits, in the East, mutual intercourse between the sexes was confined. The evil-minded persons here designated would venture, so much the less, to carry on their designs publicly, since they not only had an evil conscience, but would, besides, endeavor to preserve the appearance of godliness most carefully (ver. 5).—**And lead captive silly women,** γυναικάρια; designation of a measurably *contemptible* class of females; the slighting expression denotes their weakness, and the ease with which they are led astray Αἰχμαλωτίζειν, strictly to make captive in war; here, to bind to one with body and soul. Calvin: "*Dicit, eas captivas duci, propterea quod variis artificiis ejusmodi pseudo prophetæ eas sibi obnoxias reddunt, partim curiose omnia rimando, partim blandiendo.*"—**Laden with sins,** σεσωρευμένα ἁμαρτίαις (comp. Rom. xii. 20); *cumulatæ peccatis*, and are thereby so inconstant that they lend an ear readily to false teachers, who promise them rest through the enticing discourse of a wisdom concealed yet from others.—**Led away with divers lusts,** ἀγόμενα ἐπιθυμίαις ποικίλαις. Over against the awakened conscience stands ever the governing sinful passion, which seeks satisfaction in a system set forth and lauded by unprincipled teachers (vers. 1–5). As the Lord already accused, in His day, the Pharisees, and those learned in the Scripture, of a like thinking and acting (Matt. xiii. 14), especially in respect of widows, so also was it the business of the false teachers, in the days of Paul, to operate, before all, upon women. They were most easily led; at the same time, also, they were instruments for the gratification of the sensual desires of their corrupters; and when once they became bound, body and soul, to their cause, they could soon, in their turn, win new adherents. From different testimonies of the church-fathers, made with allusion more or less explicit to this word of the Apostle, it appears that the ancient heretics availed themselves especially of this instrumentality in the furtherance of their designs. In this respect, the passage of Jerome, in his letter to Ctesiphon, is classical: "*Simon Magus hæres in condidit adjutus auxilio Helenæ meretricis; Nicolaus Antiochenus, conditor omnium immunditiarum, choros duxit fæmineos; Marcion quoque Romano præmisit mulierem ad majorem lasciviam, Apelles Philemonem comitem habuit; Montanus Priscam et Maximillam primum auro corrupit, deinde hæresi polluit; Arius, ut orbem deciperet, sororem principio ante decepit. Donatus Lucillæ opibus adjutus est, Elpidium cæcum Agape cæca duxit, Priscilliano juncta fuit Galla.*"—"Simon Magus founded his heresy by the help of Helena, a prostitute; Nicolaus of Antioch, the founder of all impurities, led about troops of women; Marcion also sent in advance a woman to Rome for his greater pleasure; Apelles had Philumena for a companion; Montanus first corrupted Prisca and Maximilla with gold, and then polluted them with heresy; Arius, that he might deceive the world, deceived first the sister of his prince; Donatus was aided by the fortune of Lucilla; the blind Agape led the blind Elpidius; Galla was allied to Priscillian."—[But Jerome himself sought and enjoyed especially the association of women. If it be true that heresiarchs have been aided by them, it is equally true that they have rendered, in all ages of the Church, valuable assistance in all good work.—E. H.]—**Silly women** (γυναικάρια = little women [perhaps, according to the modern phrase, small specimens of the sex.—E. H.]).

Ver. 7. **Ever learning, and never able to come,** &c. A fine irony, which renders the Apostle's inward hatred of this sham-holy life all the more conspicuous. Because *learning* is not the actual design in the intercourse of these women with the false teachers named here, but only the means and excuse for the gratification of their sinful, bad desire, they never come to an end with it.—**And never able to come to the knowledge of the truth,** because moral receptivity, the disposition of the heart, which, according to John vii. 17, is granted, fails them wholly. Calvin: "*Discunt, ut sunt curiosæ, deinde animo inquieto, sed ita, ut nihil unquam certi nec veri assequantur. Hoc autem præposterum est studium, cui non respondet scientia. Quamquam videntur sibi tales egregie sapere, sed nihil est, quod sciunt, dum veritatem non tenent, quæ fundamentum est omnis scientiæ.*"

Ver. 8. **Now as Jannes and Jambres.** Paul shows, by an example, still more particularly the relation in which known misguided minds had placed themselves towards Christian truth. *Jannes* and

Jambres, according to the Jewish tradition, were the chiefs of the Egyptian magicians, who tried their arts over against the wonders of Moses, and thereby held Pharaoh back from faith in the word, and from obedience of the command of God. According to the legend, they were brothers (the names were written variously; *e. g.*, Ἰωάννης instead of Ἰαννῆς, and Μαμβρῆς instead of Ἰαμβρῆς), sons of Balaam, first the teachers, afterwards the opponents of Moses, and who perished also in the Red Sea during the pursuit of the Israelites (see Wetstein on the place). As to the question how the Apostle could have come into possession of the statements here given, Origen answered that he had derived it from a *liber secretus*. Theodoret, on the other hand, that he had become acquainted with it from Jewish tradition, and from revelation of the Holy Ghost. It is worthy of remark, that not only Jewish, but also heathen writers (Pliny and Numenius), mention both names; whence we may properly conclude that this tradition must have been pretty generally diffused, and from these grounds may also assume that Paul, as he elsewhere quotes Greek authors and cites proverbial expressions, so also he derived something for once out of the not always muddy source of Jewish tradition; which, moreover, he does not use, while he appeals to it, to prove anything doubtful, but only to represent his meaning more distinctly through reference to traditionary names and actions, the correctness of which may, in other respects, remain uncertain. When he says, *Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses*, ὃν τρόπον, it is not indispensably necessary thence to conclude that the false teachers, who were opposing themselves, made use of the *same means* as Jannes and Jambres; but it can just as well signify that they did the *same* with like furiousness. We cannot, however, pronounce the former view utterly incredible, when we think of Simon Magus, of Elymas the sorcerer, of the vagabond devils-conjurers amongst the Jews, and of the deceiving magical art practised from of old at Ephesus (comp. Acts xix. 19). Amid the wide extension of Chaldæan wisdom and art in those days, and taking into account the immoral character of the false teachers here branded, it is probable *à priori* that they would not have been ashamed of such instrumentalities, which were eminently fitted to work upon the senses and the fantasy, and also found a powerful support in the superstition of the multitude.—**Men of corrupt minds,** κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν (comp. 1 Tim. vi. 5). The Apostle has in his mind not the darkening of the understanding, but the moral baseness of their disposition.—**Reprobate concerning the faith,** ἀδόκιμοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν; who are not, in respect of the faith, in condition to stand the tests (Titus i. 16)—the natural result of the moral *disorder* which was delineated in the immediately preceding words. Over against this temporary supremacy of error and of sin, the Apostle has occasion to remind both himself and Timothy that this power will not last forever.

Ver. 9. **But they shall proceed no further.** This positive assurance does not at all contradict the opposite warning (chap. ii. 16), and the prophecy that follows (ver. 13). Here the Apostle speaks of the outward result; there, on the other hand, of the intrusive advance from bad to worse. Not without reason did Luther often apply these words to the priests of Rome. Bengel: "*Non proficiunt amplius, quamquam ipsi et eorum similes proficiant in pejus.*" The history of most heresics actually teaches that error constantly spreads, but that the eyes of many are thereby opened so much the quicker. Comp. Conybeare and Howson on this place. We must expect this here, no less than with the Egyptian magicians, just because absurdity and unrighteousness so often overstep all bounds.—**For their folly shall be manifest unto all men, as theirs also was** (comp. Ex. viii. 18, 19; ix. 11).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. As Peter and John, so also the Apostle Paul, towards the close of his life, becomes prophet, and announces the remote destinies and the future of the Church. The apostolical Charisma completes itself in the prophetic. The general delineation of the crimes in the last days, which the Saviour Himself (Matt. xxiv.) has given, is not mechanically repeated, but is enriched with a number of new traits. It is here also revealed that the optimistic view of the World, which expects but a continuous triumph of humanism, an advance steadily to a higher freedom, culture, and dignity in the future, cannot stand before the tribunal of Scripture.

2. It is a remarkable revelation of the divine Nemesis, that they who, with the denial of the faith, begin not seldom with the beautiful phrase, that they are zealous for morality, and wish to maintain the morals of the gospel, while they reject dogma, just upon this road advance gradually to the most decided immorality. He who digs out the tree, cannot also enjoy the fruit. Emancipation from all authority theoretically, leads practically to the promulgation of the rights of the flesh.

3. It is a remark as demonstrable as it is humiliating, that as the truth, so also error and sin have found ever a powerful support in the weaker sex (comp. 1 Tim. ii. 14). There lies in the womanly character the foundation, as for the highest development of the power of faith, so also for the highest revelation of the power of sin (comp. Rev. xvii.). Josephus also states that the Pharisees especially had found much support amongst the women ("Antiq.," 17, 2). Compare the account, moreover, of the rich Fulvia of Rome, who was induced, by two Jewish impostors, to furnish a considerable sum of gold, under the supposition that it was for the temple at Jerusalem (18, 3).

4. The opposition of the Egyptian magicians against Moses was in no wise the fruit merely of human cunning and deception, but was the work of dæmonic powers out of the kingdom of darkness, which, as a new period for the kingdom of God began with Israel's redemption, revealed its force in increased measure, and employed the magicians as its instruments.

5. "The battle of wickedness against the truth is from the beginning; the whole world-history is a struggle between the kingdoms of light and of darkness. Jannes and Jambres are a type of all seducers and deceivers, as Moses is a type of all faithful witnesses of the truth. How does hostility to the truth manifest itself? At first, the truth and its witnesses are rendered suspicious, and there is complaint of falsehood and error. Then, a counterpart of the truth is set up—a phantom, which is decked out with all deceiving attire. At last, the witnesses for the truth are attacked with persecution;" Heubner.

6. Just because error becomes more scandalous the longer it lasts, do its defenders find it impossible

to carry it on permanently. Its triumph becomes its overthrow. Error is a palace of ice, which at last must melt and tumble down necessarily, when but one ray of the sunlight of truth penetrates it.

7. If the sins here designated be, in and of themselves, so abominable, they are still worse when they are revealed in a preacher of the gospel. The word of Baxter to his brethren is of force here: "When Satan has led you to destruction, then surely he employs you to lead others to destruction. Oh, what a victory does he think he has won, when he has made a preacher corrupt and faithless, when he has entangled him in the snares of covetousness, or of some offence. He will boast against the whole Church, and say: 'These are your holy preachers! You see how it ends with their strictness, and whither they come with it!' He will boast against Christ Himself, and say: 'These are your heroes! I can make Thy best servants false to Thee—Thine own stewards deceive Thee,'" &c.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

True love does not conceal danger, but warns against it.—In how far can the doctrine (Eccl. vii. 10), even in the sphere of Christianity, avail in respect of the ever-increasing sin and misery of the future?—The higher the sun rises, so much the more does it lift vapors from the earth.—Egoism the source of all evil.—The relation in which children are accustomed to place themselves towards their parents, is also a sign of the time, and a measure for judgment of their inner sentiment towards God.—The difference and the agreement of false prophets in the differing centuries of Christianity.—The show and the power of godliness: (1.) How often does the one take on outwardly the form of the other; (2.) how it is possible to distinguish each from the other.—Whence comes it that the errors of a false Gnosis have, at all times, found so much sympathy in many women's hearts?—The blending of religiosity with refined sensuousness.—Resistance of the truth: (1.) Its weapons; (2.) its sworn comrades; (3.) its stubbornness; (4.) its final fate.—Also even in the sphere of error, nothing new under the sun (Eccl. i. 9, 10).—The truth triumphs often late, but nevertheless surely at last.—The power and the impotence of error.

Starke: Spener: Self-love is twofold: (1.) A proper and divinely commanded (Matt. xxii. 39); (2.) an unrighteous and sinful.—False accusers are hateful in name and deed; they are *diaboli*, devils, and have the devil's trick.—To be rash, and to rush on, to the injury of another, belongs to the corrupted being of the world.—Show, pomp, and ostentation of Christianity enough, but there is dearth of what is best.—What is shell, without kernel?—One cannot get rid utterly of bad people, otherwise one must leave the world; enough that one knows their wickedness, and abstains from their scandalous ways, and avoids as much as possible their society (1 Cor. v. 10).—Hedinger: The more dangerous it is for women in the world, so much the more must they keep watch over themselves, and implore God for assistance amid temptations (Ps. cxliii. 10).—[Comp. Monod's famous Sermons, "*La femme*," *Sermons, troisième Série*, Paris, 1859.—E. H.]—Let no one think, when he has carried on his rascality for a long while, that he will go forever without hindrance and punishment.—Errors and false doctrines have indeed the show of truth, but the mask is easily torn off them (1 Tim. iv. 1–6).—Cramer: If the magicians of Pharaoh could not hinder the purpose of Moses, God will carry on His work indeed, notwithstanding the devil still blocks its way so often.

Heubner: How does the Christian judge of his own time?—The Christian understands his own age best.—Never can one vice remain alone.—The corrupt heart makes itself averse to the good.—When the most powerful agencies for improvement are at work, then, by the rejection of them, must the result be a correspondingly scandalous deterioration.—On the part of many, employment with religion is a sort of pastime and amusement; dispositions so formed always rove, and never come home.—To a true faith belongs a true upright heart.—The fate of the old enemies of the truth gives consolation to the friends of truth.

Lisco: Of the false teachers of the last days: (1.) Of their moral corruption; (2.) of their frightful end.—Of the tares in the Lord's Church.—(Fast-day Sermon): Of the shadow-side of life, which we recognize in the light of the gospel.

VII.

Warm praise of Timothy on account of his better disposition, and incitement to continue therein.

Ch. III. 10–17.

10 But thou hast fully known[1] [followed] my doctrine, manner of life, purpose,
11 faith, long-suffering, charity, patience, Persecutions, afflictions, which came upon
me at Antioch, at Iconium,[2] at Lystra; what persecutions I endured: but out
12 of *them* all the Lord delivered me. Yea, and all that will [desire to] live
13 godly[3] [piously] in Christ Jesus shall [will] suffer persecution. But evil men
14 and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived. But
continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of,

15 knowing of whom thou hast learned *them;* [,] And that from a child thou hast
known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation
16 through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture *is* given by inspiration
of God,[5] and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof,[6] for correction, for instruc-
17 tion in righteousness: [,] That the man of God may be perfect [complete],
thoroughly furnished unto [for] all good works [every good work].

[1] Ver. 10.—[See the exposition. Lachmann reads, *παρηκολούθησας*; so likewise the Cod. Sin. Wordsworth agrees with Tischendorf, and reads *παρηκολούθηκας*, perf.—E. H.]

[2] Ver. 11.—[The spelling here in the Cod. Sin. is peculiar: *ἀντιοχίᾳ, εἰκονίῳ*.—E. H.]

[3] Ver. 12.—[Cod. Sin., *ζῆν εὐσεβῶς*, instead of the usual order; so also A., Orig.—E. H.]

[4] Ver. 14.—With A. C. F. G., and others, *τίνων*, instead of *τίνος*, must be read. Also Lachmann, Tischendorf, Cod. Sin.

[5] Ver. 16.—[Vulg., "*Omnis Scriptura divinitus inspirata utilis est,*" &c. Murdock's Syriac-English Version: "Al scripture that was written by the Spirit is profitable," &c. Origen once (quoted by Huther), *θεόπνευστος οὖσα, ὠφέλιμος ἐστι.* Bishop Pearson: "All scripture *was* given," &c. ("Creed," Am. ed., p. 490). Wordsworth's critical note upon this passage is simply amazing. See the place, vol. ii., p 477. He renders: "Every portion of Scripture being inspired (*i. e., because* it is inspired), is also profitable," and makes it apply not only to the Old Testament, but also to all the books of the New Testament, which were written before A. D. 67.—The following, by the late Henry Nelson Coleridge, who edited Samuel Taylor Coleridge's "Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit," may interest the reader (pp. 96, 97): "The English version is: 'All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable,' &c. And in this rendering of the original, the English is countenanced by the established version of the Dutch Reformed Church: '*Alle de Schrift is van Godt ingegeven, en de is nuttigh,*' &c. And by Diodati: '*Tutta la Scrittura è divinamente inspirata, ed util,*' &c. And by Beza: '*Tota Scriptura divinitus est inspirata, et utilis,*' &c.—The other rendering is supported by the Vulgate: '*Omnis Scriptura, divinitus inspirata, utilis est ad,*' &c. By Luther: '*Denn alle Schrift, von Gott eingegeben, ist nütze zur,*' &c. And by Calmet: '*Toute l'Ecriture, qui est inspirée de Dieu, est utile,*' &c. And by the common Spanish translation: '*Toda Escritura, divinamente inspirada, es util para enseñar,*' &c. This is also the rendering of the Syriac (Pesch.), and the Arabic version, and is followed by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and most of the Fathers. See the note in Griesbach. Tertullian represents the sense thus: '*Legimus, Omnem Scripturam, ædificatione habilem, divinitus inspirari,*' De Habit. Mal., c. iii. Origen has it several times, *θεόπνευστος οὖσα, ὠφέλιμός ἐστι*, and once as in the received text."—E. H.]

[6] Ver. 16.—[Lachmann reads *ἐλεγμόν*, after A. C. G., instead of *ἔλεγχον*; so, too, Sin. The meaning is the same.—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 10. **But thou,** &c., **Σὺ δέ.** But *thou;* with these words the Apostle returns to Timothy, not to praise him unnecessarily, but to appeal to Timothy himself, as to a witness, that his teacher and friend had walked an entirely different path from that of those false teachers. The recurrence to the example furnished him by the Apostle (vers. 10–13) serves to introduce also the exhortation to enduring fidelity (vers. 14–17).—**Thou hast fully known my doctrine,** *παρηκολούθησας* (after A. C. F. G.; Tischendorf has, after D. E. I. K., and others, *παρηκολούθηκας*, as in 1 Tim. iv. 6); either, thou hast *attended* to my doctrine, &c., as an eye-witness (or in thought), or, Thou hast followed my doctrine, &c., as if *it were a pattern.* The latter most probably. "The Apostle's *διδασκαλίαι*, &c., are regarded as the leaders by which Timothy allowed himself to be directed in the course of his life—guiding stars, as it were, which he followed;" (Huther).—**Manner of life,** *τῇ ἀγωγῇ* (comp. Esther ii. 20); general designation of the rule of conduct pursued by Paul, the *ratio vivendi et agendi* (Luther: "My way").—**Purpose,** *τῇ προθέσει* (comp. Acts xi. 23); the decided resolution of the heart to remain true to the high calling of his life.—**Faith, long-suffering, charity, patience.** There is nothing incongruous in the thought that Timothy also had suffered for the cause of Christ, but under this suffering, true to the example of Paul, had been as little discouraged as to allow himself to be allured into resistance. The mention of the *ὑπομονή* gives the Apostle occasion for a still more definite communication respecting the circumstances in which this Christian virtue had particularly served his turn.

Ver. 11. **Persecutions, afflictions,** &c. (comp. 2 Cor. xi. 24–28; Col. i. 24, and other places).—**Which came unto me at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra** (comp. Acts xiii. 50.; xiv. 19). The question has been asked, why the Apostle selected just these pages from the journal of the history of his sufferings. The reason is obvious. In those regions Timothy was known from childhood; there had he first met the Apostle; there had he received the first impression of his word and work; and perhaps the lofty spirit of Paul's faith, which he evinced under these persecutions, had co-operated in the conversion of Timothy. Besides this also, before all, towards the end of his course, the recollection of the *first* deeds and sufferings of the servant of Christ came forcibly into the foreground. — **What persecutions I endured,** *οἵους διωγμοὺς ὑπήνεγκα*; no exclamation (Erasmus, Flatt, Mack, Heydenreich), but a simple relative proposition in proof of his *ὑπομονή*, but at the same time a transition to the humble glorifying of God.—**But out of (them) all the Lord delivered me** (comp. chap. iv. 17, 18). Calvin: "*Consolatio, quæ temperat afflictionum acerbitatem, quod scil. prosperum finem habent. Ergo perinde hoc valet, ac si dixisset: expertus es, deum mihi nunquam defuisse, ita non est, quod dubites, meo exemplo ipsum sequi.*"

Ver. 12. **Yea, and all . . . suffer persecution.** Just as the Apostle desires to avoid the appearance even of regarding his persecutions for the cause of the Lord as anything entirely exceptional, on account of which he might be not a little proud, he adds the observation, to what has already been said, that in the kingdom of God, on the contrary, the rule is of force for all, to enter into glory through suffering, and that therefore Timothy also, if he desired it even, would not be able to avoid this suffering, unless he wished wholly to deny his calling. Although it is not improbable that he utters this prophecy of distress especially in view of the approaching *καιροὶ χαλεποί* (comp. ver. 13), his word need not be at all restricted thereto. He proclaims persecution for **all that will live godly in Christ Jesus.** *Θέλοντες* used here, with emphasis, of the governing determination to follow after godliness in spite of all hindrances. The words have the

sense, *all who resolve*, who are discreet therein, *to live piously*, &c. (see WINER, *Gramm.*, p. 541). The Christian life is represented here designedly as a life of godliness, with a side glance at the immoral life and endeavor of the false teachers. But that no other godliness than that which springs forth from the roots of a living faith is here under consideration, is sufficiently clear from the additional clause, *in Christ Jesus*.

Ver. 13. **But evil men and seducers,** &c. Once again the Apostle comes back to what has been said, vers. 1–9, as well to refer to one of the immediate causes of the predicted persecutions, ver. 12, as also to remove from Timothy the possible misconception that he would be able to disarm wholly the enemies of the truth by a godly walk and endurance. —*Evil men and seducers*, γόητες; here no species of the general genus πονηροὶ ἄνθρωποι, but a more specific designation of these latter, in proof that he speaks expressly of those bad men whom he had described before, and, ver. 8, had compared with Egyptian magicians. (Upon these Goëtæ generally, see LECHLER, "Acts," p. 103.) It is a very flat explanation to translate the word, without farther signification, only in the sense of deceivers.—**Shall wax worse and worse** (see upon chap. ii. 16; iii. 9).—**Deceiving and being deceived,** πλανῶντες καὶ πλανώμενοι; occupied continually in deceiving, and in error. He who leads others in the way of error, remains himself, by no possibility, in the right way.

Ver. 14. **But continue thou,** &c. Here also, as in ver. 10, is Timothy placed, in a complimentary way, over against the false teachers, but at the same time is warned emphatically to continue to walk in the way already struck upon.—**But continue thou in the things,** ἐν οἷς = ἐν τούτοις, ἃ ἔμαθες (comp. John viii. 31; Matt. xxiv. 13).—**Which thou hast learned and hast been assured of.** The last word is added, because, without this subjective conviction of the heart, it would not have been possible for Timothy to hold out in the things he had learned, amid so many persecutions. Πιστόω = *confirmo*, πιστοῦν τινα; to convince any one of anything, to furnish him with authentic knowledge (the Vulgate incorrectly: *quæ tibi credita sunt;* and Luther: "And to thee is *entrusted*"). The Apostle will simply state that the thing learned was the possession of Timothy not objectively only, but subjectively also. Still one, but one touching (*intime*) recollection, he now adds: **Knowing of whom thou hast learned them;** in other words, Thou knowest that thou hast not learned the truth from an unknown and suspicious quarter, but from a quarter which deserves thy highest confidence. If the *Recepta*, παρὰ τίνος, be the genuine reading, then we must not, with some interpreters, think of Christ, but of Paul exclusively, as the teacher of Timothy (comp. ver. 10). If, on the other hand, with Tischendorf and others, we adopt the reading in the plural, παρὰ τίνων, according to the rule, *lectio difficilior præferenda*, then this reminder is related to chap. i. 5, and recalls to the memory of Timothy the religious instruction of Lois and Eunice, the benefit of which he had received so early, and the power and value of which it was impossible for him now to mistake. In no event, in the meanwhile, are we to think here of the πολλοὶ μάρτυρες (chap. ii. 2).

Ver. 15. **And that from a child,** &c. A second motive, which runs parallel with the first, and concludes with an encomium upon Holy Scripture itself (vers. 16, 17). *That*, ὅτι; not to be understood in the sense of *because* (Vulg., Luther), but to be conjoined with εἰδώς; "which particle is used to denote not merely knowledge, but also reflection;" (De Wette).—*From a child up*, ἀπὸ βρέφους (comp. chap. i. 5).—**Thou hast known the holy Scriptures.** ["The word ἱερά, *sacred*, is to be distinguished from ἅγια, *holy*, *sancta*. The former word, ἱερά, expresses the reverence with which these writings were regarded. It bespeaks the sacredness of the Scriptures in the general esteem and veneration of the Jewish and Christian churches; and as separated from all *common writings*. Cf. HORAT., A. P. 397: "*Secernere sacra profanis;*" Wordsworth, *in loco*.—E. H.] The Holy Scriptures here are exclusively those of the Old Testament, not at all those of the New Testament (upon an alleged citation of Luke in 1 Tim. v. 18, see upon this place). As memoranda of the especial revelation of God to His chosen people, they are called elsewhere, ἡ γραφή, γραφαὶ ἅγιαι, &c. Upon their division at that time, amongst the Jews, see upon Luke xxiv. 44.—**Which are able to make thee wise unto salvation.** Σοφίσαι, used in a somewhat different sense in 2 Peter i. 16 also, is here not to be understood of elementary, mere foundation-laying instruction, but of practical knowledge, penetrating ever deeper and deeper. Δυνάμενα must not be construed as *Præteritum* (Bengel: *quæ poterant*), but as *Præsens*. It signifies not only what the Holy Scriptures did in the youth of Timothy, but also what they are able to accomplish continuously. To make wise *unto salvation*, εἰς σωτηρίαν, is to make so wise that one becomes actually, for one's self, a partaker of the Messianic σωτηρία. The Holy Scriptures of the Old Covenant do this indeed, not in a magical-mechanical, but in an ethical-psychological way; and therefore Paul adds, through **faith which is in Christ Jesus;** *i. e.*, by means of faith, if indeed the faith in Christ Jesus be in thee. The Apostle names an indispensably necessary subjective condition for the right use of the Old Testament, through the absence of which, it is much to be feared that the use of it will not leave behind the wished-for fruit. Not every one can be made wise unto salvation by the writings of the Old Covenant, but only every one who believes in Christ. Faith in Christ is, as it were, a torch, by the light of which we can first read aright and understand the dim colonnades and mysterious inscriptions in the ancient venerable temple of the Old Covenant. ["Observe that the Apostle doth not say that these Scriptures were of themselves sufficient to make Timothy wise to salvation, but only that with 'faith in Christ Jesus' they were sufficient for that end;" Whitby, *in loco*. "Or may not the due appreciation of the Scriptures collectively be more safely relied on as the result and consequence of the belief in Christ . . .?" S. T. Coleridge.—"*Das Ansehen der heiligen Schrift kann nicht den Glauben an Christum begründen, vielmehr muss dieser schon vorausgesetzt werden um der heiligen Schrift ein besonderes Ansehen einzuräumen;*" SCHLEIERMACHER, *Glaubenslehre*, § 128.—The two foregoing extracts refer to Canonical Scripture as we recognize it. "Do we receive the Holy Scripture first, *as authority* in matters to be believed, and *therefore* Christ? Or do we receive Chrst *first*, and *therefore* the Scriptures? The question is not, whether we must know anything of Scripture, whether we must receive any of its

statements, whether we must accept its witness for Christ prior or subsequent to faith in Him; but it is, whether we shall receive it as coming, in some special sense, from God, as bearing His mark, as vested with some authority, prior or subsequent to faith in our Lord. Commonly, the order now insisted upon by preachers and apologists for the gospel is, the Holy Scriptures *first*, and therefore Christ. I believe in the reversal of this order, and maintain, Christ first, and therefore the Scriptures;" Sermon on the "Order in Things to be Believed."—E. H.]

Ver. 16. **All Scripture is given by inspiration of God.** ["Every portion of Scripture, being inspired (*i. e.*, *because* it is inspired), is also profitable;" Wordsworth on the place.] Although the article is wanting here, nevertheless, by virtue of the connection, it is not to be doubted a moment that the Apostle is speaking decidedly and exclusively of the γραφή of the Old Covenant, as of a well-completed *whole*. *All Scripture* is to be taken in the same sense as πᾶσα οἰκοδομή (Eph. ii. 21), *the whole* building; πᾶσα πατρία (Eph. iii. 15), *the whole* race; πᾶσα ἀναστροφή (1 Peter i. 15), *the whole* conversation. In no case can the absence of the article in a word so frequently used as γραφή surprise us, since it is employed, in fact, almost as a proper name. The Apostle speaks also of the *collection* of the Old Testament Scriptures, without excepting any portion either directly or indirectly, although he will not have attributed, naturally, to all the books of this collection an equal value. Had he wished to say only: *Each Scripture* which is given by God is useful also (De Wette), he would not only have written something very vague and of little importance, but *also* he would have lost sight of the whole distinction between sacred and profane Scripture, which in this place, least of all, could have been his purpose. —*Given by inspiration of God*, Θεόπνευστος; first attribute of Scripture, whereupon further, in a breath, the other praise follows, καὶ ὠφέλιμος, κ.τ.λ. Luther incorrectly: All Scripture, given by God, is useful, &c.; Bengel, better: "Θεόπν. *est pars, non subjecti, sed prædicati quam enim scripturam dicit Paulus, per se patet.*" It is just as arbitrary to leave out καὶ, as it is to translate it here by *also* (Heinrichs). That an inspired composition was *also* useful, was intelligible of itself indeed; but it is evidently here the design of the Apostle to give his witness to Scripture by a general commendation, and to direct the attention of Timothy to it for (in view of) the time when Paul would no longer be here. "*Etiam post Pauli obitum Timotheus eo magis ad Scripturam alligatur. Non ad sese unum Paulus adstringit Timotheum, sed eum quamlibet adultum in fide filium Scripturas jubet adhibere. Hoc perpendere, debent, qui doctoribus suis, quorum disciplinæ semel innutriti erant, ita se addicunt, ut extra eorum circulum nihil e scriptura deinceps oblatum admittant;*" Bengel.—*Given by inspiration of God*, Θεόπνευστος; to be taken, like ἔμπνευστος, and others, in a passive sense (see WINER, p. 88) = *diviniter inspirata*, breathed through and inspired by God; so that the Divine Spirit makes up its principle (comp. 2 Peter i. 21). For the behoof, further, of the right conception of the matter, the passages of the classical writers, where they make mention of the divine afflatus, are to be compared; *e. g.*, the known word of Cicero, "*Nemo vir magnus sine aliquo afflatu divino unquam fuit.*" *De Nat. Deo*, ii., 66, &c., quoted by De Wette upon this place.—**And is profitable for doctrine,** πρὸς διδασκαλίαν; for theoretical instruction in everything in the sphere of religion, which without it would remain unknown to us.—**For reproof,** πρὸς ἔλεγχον (or ἐλεγμόν) (comp. Titus ii. 15; 1 Tim. v. 20); for the reproving conviction of all that is unholy and ungodly in man.—**For correction,** πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν (ἅπαξ λεγόμ.) = *emendatio;* strictly, the placing right again.—**For instruction,** πρὸς παιδείαν, *ad institutionem* (comp. Titus ii. 12). The Holy Scripture of the Old Testament remains the instruction-book for the new man in Christ Jesus.—**In righteousness,** τὴν (*sc.* παιδείαν) ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ; a more precise exhibition of the sphere of life in which the just-named παιδεία moves, namely, that of unfeigned godliness.

Ver. 17. **That the man of God,** &c.; statement not of the aim of Scripture in general, but of the design of the just-named instruction, which indeed is secured only through the Scripture. *The man of God* (1 Tim. vi. 11); a special description of Timothy (see the place) here, of the Christian generally, as of a man who is born of God through the Holy Ghost, and is affiliated with God. For every Christian who makes the prescribed use of the Scripture, aims at the instruction it imparts, there is the same high goal.—**Perfect,** ἄρτιος (ἅπαξ λεγόμ.) = τέλειος (Col. i. 28); strictly, fitting.—**Thoroughly furnished unto all good works** (comp. Eph. ii. 10); in other words: *Aptus ad omne bonum opus peragendum.* Usually the word ἔργον ἀγαθόν is construed here in an official relation (Bengel: "*Genera talium operum enumerantur,*" ver. 16); but there is nevertheless no reason for confining the meaning of the Apostle in such narrow limits. He wishes to say, in a wholly general manner, what instruction by the Scripture will secure for every believer, continuous, growing, inward capacity and readiness for the accomplishment of everything pleasing to the Lord.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Paul, also in this portion of his communication to Timothy, himself an example of a true and conscientious pastor. "*Ars artium est regimen animarum.*" Saying of Gregory the Great in his *cura pastoralis*.

2. It is an inestimable privilege, when one feels free, as Paul, to refer not only to his word, but also to his example. This can he only, who, with the same fidelity as the great Apostle, knows how to surrender himself to the principle, that with the preacher even everything must preach.

3. The history of the sufferings and of the deliverance of Paul, is in many respects typical for subsequent ministers of the word.

4. The education of Timothy is a convincing proof of the blessing of family devotion to God. Church and school must be inwardly united, if they will work upon the heart for faith and conversion. There is no more effectual agency for the unchristianizing of a State, than the banishment of the Holy Scriptures from the schools, in consideration of indifferentists, deists, and Jews, as is the case now, *e. g.*, in Holland [and likely to become the case in the United States. A very serious matter for the Christian people of this country. We are organized under a Constitution which guarantees *liberty of conscience*. There are some millions of our citizens who are conscientiously opposed to the use of the Bible in the public schools. The Constitution was framed

by Protestants; but the unforeseen character of the immigration has demanded, and demands now, an utterly unforeseen application of our organic laws. Positive Christianity cannot therefore be taught in the public schools of the country, under the sanction of the Constitution.—E. H.]

5. There was a time when the Old Testament was placed unhesitatingly side by side with the New, and the theologian confirmed religious truths promiscuously by a number of citations from both, as the jurist appealed to the *Corpus Juris*. Through the influence of the Schleiermacher-theology, on the other hand, an undervaluation of the Old Testament has come up, which likewise has brought no blessing upon the Church. For the development of modern theology, much will depend upon the relation in which it will place itself to the Scriptures of the Old Covenant. The Apostle gives us here (ver. 15) a valuable hint for the right decision, which is as far removed from an undervaluation, as from an overestimate of it.

6. Upon this statement of the Apostle (vers. 15–17) is founded the churchly doctrine of the *perspicuitas et sufficientia sacræ Scripturæ*. What is said here actually of the Old Testament, can be affirmed with far higher propriety of the New; and the Roman Catholic prohibition of the Bible has difficulty in maintaining itself against such convincing testimonies (comp. John v. 39; Luke xvi. 31, and other places). It is worthy of remark, that Paul, in view of death, has likewise given such a testimony concerning Scripture. Certainly it is proof that he, the Apostle of liberty, bowed unqualifiedly and humbly before the well-understood *authority* of the word of God. It is as if he foresaw the whole calamity which departure from the words of Scripture would one day bring upon the Church of the Lord. A faithful and honest adherence to Scripture is the best Palladium for the Church against rationalism, mysticism, and Romanism.

7. The dogma of the inspiration of Scripture belongs also to those which urgently demand a new treatment and development. [John Sterling, according to the late Archdeacon Hare, "grew to regard an intelligent theory of inspiration, and of the relation of the Bible to the faith which it conveys, as the most pressing want of our Church. That it is a most pressing one, is indeed certain; and such it has long been acknowledged to be by those who meditate on theology." (HARE, "Mem.," p. cxxx.). This is only one voice; but the echoes of it are audible in every quarter. It may be doubted if the subject admit of reduction to *dogmatic form*. What the *authority* of the sacred Scripture is, may be readily stated; what its *inspiration* is, will inevitably be stated under a variety of forms—certainly until men will, by common consent, observe the difference between *inspiration* and an *infallible intelligence* in the person inspired. I look, therefore, to an "intelligent theory" rather than to a satisfactory setting forth, under new forms, of the *dogma* of inspiration.—E. H.] While the notion of a purely mechanical inspiration, according to which the sacred writers were nothing more than *scribæ et actuarii Spiritus Sancti*, simply without volition, has been properly relinquished as untenable, very little has as yet been done, comparatively, for the development of the conception of Scripture as an organic whole, by which as well the divine as the human side must be distinctly set forth. An article by RICHARD ROTHE, *Zur Dogmatik*, in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1859 [and published in book form, *Zur Dogmatik*, 1863], contains valuable hints. Our passage has always been regarded correctly, in this respect, as classical, since what the Apostle here says of the Old Testament is still more emphatically true of the New. We must nevertheless acknowledge that this passage alone is not sufficient to found a theory of inspiration upon, since the *relation* of human activity to the disposing power of the Spirit of God in the composition of Holy Scripture is not stated in words, and the question, whether we must consider here an inspiration of words, or of things, remains wholly unanswered. A correct theory of inspiration will not rest upon this or the other passage of Scripture, but can truly and vitally result only from a consideration of the object which is the product of Divine inspiration. The Baconian observation—method (induction) carries us farther here, than the atomistic procedure of those who, in their critical zeal, cut up Scripture into a number of pieces, but who, amid this, have no eye for the complete unity of Scripture, and who do not observe the forest, in their preference for particular trees. One can consult farther, upon this disputed point, the dogmatic writings of Twesten, Martensen, Nitzsch, Lange, and others, and also particularly what always remains a significant work, even when one cannot follow in all respects the views of the author: GAUSSEN, *Theopneustie ou inspiration plenière des saintes Écritures*, as well as also the weighty letters of FRED. DE ROUGEMONT, *Christ et ses Témoins*, Paris, 1856, 2 vols. Furthermore, the sterling French productions of P. Jalaguyer, Merle d'Aubigné, not to mention others of late years. Among the ablest advocates for the authority and inspiration of Holy Writ against modern unbelief in the Dutch Reformed Church, the name of Isaac da Costa (1860) deserves always to be held in honor. We need also here the "*non nova, sed nove*" of Vincentius of Lirins.

8. The *quadruplex usus* of the Sacred Scripture of the Old Covenant, is confirmed by the Apostle's own example, who, in his writings, often employs the Old Testament for all these different ends. For *doctrine*, he makes use, *e. g.*, of the history of Abraham (Gen xv. 6), in the discussion of the doctrine of justification, Rom. iv. For *reproof*, as often as he puts to shame his opponents by citations from the Old Testament, *e. g.*, Rom. ix.–xi. For *correction*, *e. g.*, 1 Cor. x. 1–10. For *instruction* (comp. Heb. xii. 7), Rom. xv. 4. Amongst all the Apostles, no one deserves in a higher degree than Paul the honorable title of a *doctor biblicus*. The manner and way in which he has considered, employed, and quoted the Old Testament, alone would deserve to constitute the subject-matter of a special inquiry.

9. "Holy Scripture is the treasury and armory of the Christian Church. It meets every need of the children of God. Each irresolute, struggling Christian, powerless in doubt, must lay the blame upon himself if he do not employ this source of strength and of life;" Heubner.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Timothy a pattern of true devotion: (1.) To the example of Paul; (2.) to the words of Holy Scripture.—Well for the teacher who has a disciple like Timothy, but well also for the scholar who has a leader like Paul.—The path of suffering of the

Apostle Paul a revelation: (1.) Of the power of sin which pursued him; (2.) of the greater power of faith which sustained him; (3.) of the omnipotence of the Lord who delivered him out of all.—The way of suffering the way of glory for every disciple of Christ: (1.) An old way; (2.) a difficult way; (3.) a safe way; (4.) a blessed way.—Fanaticism and intentional deception are usually most closely connected in false teachers.—"Hold fast that which thou hast learned" (text for confirmation address).—The overestimation and the undervaluation of the Old Testament are both condemned by Paul.—The blessings of a God-fearing education.—The value, the authority, and the right use of Holy Scripture.—The bread of life, by means of which the new man shall grow up.—The effect of the word of truth a convincing proof of its heavenly origin.—The entire pericope (vers. 14-17) pre-eminently adapted for discourses at Bible-celebrations or Reformation-sermons.—The value of the Sacred Scripture especially for the evangelical Church.

STARKE: CRAMER: If there be many corrupting and evil babblers, there are notwithstanding, here and there, also truthful and good teachers.—Let the former go, follow the latter.—Wilt thou be pious, and have good days only? Thou errest. Consider! So it has been good for no saint; here do battle, there rest.—HEDINGER: If one be persecuted, he must not therefore conclude at once that he is a hypocrite or godless.—To have been led away, does not exculpate, yet has the seducer the greater sin, although both are ruined.—OSIANDER: He who will teach others rightly, and will himself live rightly, must beforehand learn rightly.—LANGII *Op.*: Let each Christian consider that, by virtue of his baptismal covenant, he must be a man of God, who does not live unto himself, nor unto the world, but with denial of self and of the world, unto God.—The perfection of a Christian shows itself amid the imperfection therein, that he apply sincerely and continually the received divine power of grace not only for one and for another, but for all good works (Heb. xiii. 21).

HEUBNER: Are we able to bear witness before God, that we, for Christ's sake, would suffer persecution? then have we in so far forth abundant consolation (Matt. v. 11).—There is no standing still in evil.—Is there a more melancholy spectacle than a man who ever sinks deeper and deeper?—An actual conviction, not a mere outwardly received opinion, alone gives courage in preaching.—It is especially the mother's duty to make the children acquainted with the Bible.—The Bible should be the proper storehouse for the clergy.—LISCO: As the walk, so the reward.—Search the Scripture.—Of the power of the Divine word.—The word of God an indispensable teacher, a severe ruler, and a genuine helper to salvation.—THOLUCK: Seven remarkable sermons upon Holy Scripture, as means of grace, according to the leading of this text, in the fourth volume of his "Sermons," 1843, pp. 48-139.—VAN OOSTERZEE, Sermon on vers. 14-17. Upon the value and right use of Holy Writ: (1.) Its value (vers. 16, 17); (*a*) Its origin; (*b*) its uses; (*c*) its power; (2.) its use (vers. 14, 15; (*a*) Search the Scriptures early; (*b*) use them believingly; (*c*) remain true to them always.

THOLUCK: "A Book that has had such a past as the Bible, will have also a future."

VIII.

Solemn concluding exhortation to Timothy to fidelity in his work, strengthened by the prophetic announcement of the approaching decease of the Apostle.

CH. IV. 1-8.

1 I charge *thee* therefore[1] before God, and the Lord[2] Jesus Christ, who shall
judge the quick and the dead at[3] [and I charge thee by] his appearing and his
2 kingdom: [,] Preach the word; [,] be instant in season, out of season; [,]
3 reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine. For the time will
come when they will not endure sound doctrine; [,] but after their own lusts
4 shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; [,] And they shall
5 turn away *their* ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables. But watch
thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full
6 proof of thy ministry. For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my
7 departure is at hand. I have fought a [the] good fight, I have finished *my* [the]
8 course, I have kept the faith: Henceforth there is laid up for me a [the] crown
of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall [will] give me at
that day: [,] and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.

[1] Ver. 1.—The οὖν of the *Recepta* to be omitted. See Tischendorf on the place. [So, too, with ἐγώ.—E. H.]
[2] Ver. 1.—τοῦ κυρίου of the *Recepta*. A. C. D.[1] F. G., Cod. Sin. 31, 37, and others, are against it.
[3] Ver. 1.—With Tischendorf, we read καί, instead of the κατά of the *Recepta*.
[4] Ver. 2.—[Vulg.: *Insta oportune importune*.—E. H.]
[5] Ver. 2.—[Cod. Sin., παρακ. ἐπιτίμη; so G., Orig.—E. H.]
[6] Ver. 3.—[The reading of the *Recepta*, τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τὰς ἰδίας, is relinquished universally now. The true reading

doubtless is, κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας; A. C. D.,[1] and others; Griesbach, Tischendorf, Lachmann, Wordsworth, Cod. Sin.—E. H.]

[7] Ver. 6.—[Lachmann reads τῆς ἀναλύσεως μου, and so the Cod. Sin., instead of the τ. ἐμῆς ἀναλ. of the *Recepta*, which is followed by Tischendorf.—E. H.]

[8] Ver. 7.—[τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν καλόν, *Recepta*. Lachmann, Cod. Sin., τ. καλὸν ἀγῶνα. Tischendorf and Wordsworth adhere to the *Recepta*.—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **I charge (thee)**, &c. The Apostle evidently is hastening to the end, and recapitulates once more, in few words, all his previous admonitions. Διαμαρτύρομαι; the same solemn injunction occurs in 1 Tim. v. 21; vi. 13.—**Before God and the Lord Jesus Christ**, ἐνώπιον; so that both, as invisible witnesses, were considered personally present. —**Who shall judge the quick and the dead**, refers directly to Jesus Christ, who stands already prepared to appear as Judge. Nothing is more fitted to fill the mind with lofty fervor, than the thought of the accounting which shall be made once before His judgment-seat. The *quick*, are they who shall be alive at the Parousia; but then, suddenly, in the twinkling of an eye, shall be changed (1 Cor. xv. 51, 52). The *dead*, on the other hand, are they who have fallen asleep before the return of the Lord, and then shall be awakened (comp. John v. 27–29).—**And (declare) his appearing and his kingdom.** Were the reading of the *Recepta*, κατὰ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν, correct, we should be compelled to consider these words as the fixing of the time for the κρίνειν; but external and internal grounds combine here to give the preference to the καί. ["This restoration of καί is a happy one. It indicates that the Apostle has a clear view of Christ's coming and of His kingdom, and by a noble prosopopœia appeals to them as witnesses: 'I conjure thee in the sight of God, and the future Judge of all, by His coming and His kingdom.' This mode of speech had been suggested by the Hebrew Scriptures, especially in the LXX Version (Deut. iv. 26), where Moses calls heaven and earth to witness: Διαμαρτύρομαι ὑμῖν σήμερον τὸν τέ οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν. See also Deut. xxx. 19; xxxi. 28, where this phrase introduces solemn appeals to the elements as God's witnesses of His dealings with His people, and as remembrances of their duties to Him;" Wordsworth, *in loco*.—E. H.] (See Tischendorf on the place.) Διαμαρτύρ. must also be repeated once more, and the following accusative, τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν, not be regarded as the witness before whom the solemn "charging" takes place (De Wette), but as the object which is "charged" solemnly. ["I adjure thee before God, and Jesus Christ, who is about to judge the living and the dead; I adjure thee by His appearing and His kingdom," &c.; Conybeare and Howson.—E. H.] Whilst the Apostle declares by it that he has also in view the return and the kingdom of Christ expressly, he imparts a lofty emphasis to his succeeding admonition. The appearing (ἐπιφάνεια) of Christ (comp. 1 Tim. vi. 14) is His last coming in glory, in contrast with His first appearance on earth in the form of a servant, the kingdom, βασιλεία, which He will consequently reveal and set up.

Ver. 2. **Preach the word**, &c. Κηρύσσειν signifies a loud and open proclaiming, like that of the κῆρυξ who announces the approach of his king (for the contrast, see Isa. lvi. 10). *The word;* viz., of the gospel, in its whole compass, without taking away or thrusting into the background any part of it.—**Be instant [therewith]** (Vulg.: *insta*), **in season, out of season**, εὐκαίρως, ἀκαίρως. Proverbial mode of expression, which means that Timothy should always declare the word of God where it was not made impossible for him, naturally or morally. For various examples of like juxtapositon, in Greek and Roman writers, see Bengel on this place. For the rest, what concerns the exhortation itself, it is obvious that it must be interpreted *cum grano salis*, and find its natural limitation in the Lord's own command (Matt. vii. 6). Timothy should fulfil his calling, not indeed when the time was so inopportune that they could receive no benefit, but when *to himself* it might be inconvenient. "For the truth, it is ever the fitting time; who waits until circumstances completely favor his undertaking, will never accomplish anything, but will remain in inactivity;" Huther. In the verbs here following, the separate parts of the public ministry thus enjoined are set forth: **Reprove**, ἔλεγξον; convince, set right, blame, not only what manifests an heretical character, but, in general, whatsoever is not according to the word and will of the Lord.—**Rebuke**, ἐπιτίμησον; somewhat stronger than the foregoing—blame, with expression of repugnance (comp. Jude 9).—**Exhort**, παρακάλεσον; speak to, so, however, that it be neither impatiently vehement, nor without proper insight, but rather ἐν πάσῃ μακροθυμίᾳ, καὶ διδαχῇ, no hendiadys, but a reference to the frame of mind and form in which the admonition should be given. It must be imparted with the greatest gentleness, and at the same time so directed that it shall actually communicate instruction. For the rest, in the εὐκαίρως, ἀκαίρως, the statement of Beza in particular deserves mention: "*Nempe quod ad carnis prudentiam pertinet, nam alioqui requiritur sanctæ prudentiæ spiritus, captans occasiones ad ædificationem opportunas.*"

Ver. 3. **For the time will come.** The exhortation is strengthened here also by reference to a disturbed future, the more definite relations of which are fully designated in 1 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Tim. iii. 1, and of which the germs are already existing. Bengel, in so far correctly: "*Aderit et jam est.*"—**When they will not endure sound doctrine.** To an idle and wicked minister, this would serve as an excuse for silence; to Timothy it would serve so much more as a reason for speaking in order to proclaim the truth. By this ὑγιαινούσης διδασκαλίας is to be understood, moreover, as in Titus ii. 1, and elsewhere, the original apostolic doctrine which is founded upon the facts of redemption and tends to godliness, over against the abstract and unfruitful controversies of the false teachers. All who cannot endure this (οὐκ ἀνέξονται), manifest thereby an inward disinclination, which results from the secret collision of their own sentiment with the substance and claims of sound doctrine. The natural sequence of this antipathy is stated immediately after: **But after . . . shall they heap.** Ἐπισωρεύειν, ἅπαξ λεγόμ. To heap up, abundantly provide (Luther: "To load themselves with"). Although the idea of *a load*, which they thus burden themselves with, is not expressed precisely, yet the contemptible and objectionable trait of their whole striving and working is here plainly enough signified. Their *own* lusts (ἴδιαι emphatic), which direct them in this,

stand in direct opposition to the demands of the word of God to which they were bound to submit. It is less, in itself considered, the large number of teachers chosen in this way, than the ceaseless change which pleases these men, and for which they crave. The innermost motive is expressed in the words: **Having itching ears,** κνηθόμενοι τὴν ἀκοήν; strictly, while they are tickled in hearing (κνηθ. passive); *i. e.*, while they wish to hear what pleasantly tickles the ear. We find a striking parallel to the description of these men in the portraiture of the contemporaries of Ezekiel (Ezek. xxxiii. 30–33). Paul brings to the notice of Timothy as well *the reason* why they heap up their own teachers, as also *the standard* which they apply in the choice of them.

Ver. 4. **And they shall turn away,** &c. It is the eternal punishment of him who departs from the apostolic witnesses, that he loses himself in the whirlpool of manifold errors. Whosoever will not listen to what is true, but only to what is pleasant, will, at last, wholly abandon himself to silly fantastic chimeras.—**Shall be turned unto fables.** The familiar μῦθοι of the false teachers (see upon 1 Tim. iv. 7). In general opposition to the ἀλήθεια, we are to understand not only fables in the peculiar sense of the term, but all those expressions of their own wisdom, without the light of heavenly truth, which we have learned to recognize as without ground historically, untenable doctrinally, and without aim or uses practically.

Ver. 5. **But watch thou,** &c., νῆφε; *i. e.*, not only *watchful*, in opposition to those who are sunken in spiritual death-sleep, but *sober*, in opposition to the condition of spiritual drunkenness in which they find themselves who are described in vers. 3, 4. They can be overcome only when one, over against their exaggeration and self-will, keeps and well looks to the greatest possible caution and clearness of spirit, that one be not one's self entrapped.—**Endure afflictions,** κακοπάθησον (comp. chap. i. 8; ii. 3, 9).—**Do the work of an evangelist.** Here also ἔργον, to signify that Timothy had not merely to maintain a dignity, but to fulfil likewise a weighty task. Of *evangelists* generally, see Acts xxi. 8; Eph. iv. 11. When Paul exhorts Timothy to pursue zealously the work of an evangelist, we understand that to be fully against the thing in his apprehension (2 Tim. iv. 4—ἐπὶ δὲ τοὺς μύθους ἐκτραπήσονται). Against myths, nothing is more effectual than the clear testimonies of history.—**Make full proof of thy ministry,** πληροφόρησον; *i. e.*, so exercise it that thou duly give attention to all its parts. The full measure of an efficiency is signified to which not the least thing should be wanting. The Dutch translation less correct: Work that one may be *fully assured* of thy ministry. So also Beza: "*Veris argumentis comproba, te germanum esse Dei ministrum.*" Not upon the *proof*, but upon the *perfectness* of the ministry, does the Apostle here decidedly insist. In a certain respect, we can say that this one sentence is the summing up of all his exhortations in this and in the previous Epistle. In vers. 6–8, this exhortation is farther strengthened by the announcement of his own approaching end.

Ver. 6. **For I am now ready to be offered,** σπένδομαι (comp. Phil. ii. 17). I am about to be poured out as a drink-offering; *i. e.*, not (Heydenreich), I am about to be consecrated to a victim's death, or (Wahl) *sensu medio:* I bring my blood for sacrifice; and much less still does it signify the ceasing of the apostolic work of Paul (Otto), but with unmistakable allusion to his death. I am about to be offered as a libation; my blood is to be shed as a drink-offering. So certainly is he convinced of the near approach of his death, that he beholds it in spirit as actually present, and in his affliction recognizes its beginning. In a most significant way he compares his own martyr-death not with a sacrifice proper or a burnt-offering, but with a drink-offering (Num. xv. 1–10), of a little wine and oil which is added like a supplement, and thus connects his dying for the truth with the sacrificial death of the one only μάρτυς (comp. 1 Tim. vi. 13; Col. i. 24). Like the Lord (John xii. 24), so also he represents his violent death under a gentle, lovely figure; and the repose with which he speaks, shows sufficiently how little he feared the approach of the fatal hour.—**And the time of my departure is at hand** (not, "is present;" Luther); in other words, the time of my death, now long foreseen, is to be expected. Ἀνάλυσις = *discessus* (comp. Phil. i. 25). Not derived from banquets, where those who went away were called ἀναλύοντες (as some will, in order to bring this figure into connection with the preceding), which would be extremely forced, but rather from the loosing of anchor and rope, by which the ship is impeded in steering to the place of destination ["καιρὸς ἀναλύσεως is the season of *loosing* the cable from this earthly shore, on a voyage to the eternal harbor of heavenly peace;" Wordsworth, *in loco*.—E. H.] Now, after the Apostle has reached this point, he looks *back* yet once more (ver. 7), and then (ver. 8) hopefully forward.

Ver. 7. **I have fought the good fight.** The one figure supplants the other. Yet once more the especially favorite comparison of his life with a battle comes into the foreground; a comparison which we have met before (1 Cor. ix. 24–27), and which occurs oftener in the Epistles to Timothy (1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 4). Now, in his own feeling, he stands at the end of the conflict (ἠγώνισμαι, perfect), and expresses his meaning in the following words, still more explicitly: **I have finished my course,** τὸν δρόμον τετέλεκα. He compares his agitated apostolic life with a race, which is completed only now, when, having arrived at the goal of his ministry, he sees death before his eyes (comp. Acts xx. 24; Phil. iii. 12–14).—**I have kept the faith,** τὴν πίστιν τετήρηκα; namely, the faith in Christ, in spite of all temptation to unfaithfulness. Of course, it is possible (Heydenreich) that even here the figurative mode of address is still continued, and that πίστις also signifies literally the *fidelity* in the fulfilment of the vow which, in the undertaking of a combat and race, was wont to be made to the judge, viz., that one would submit one's self entirely to the rules of the strife. In the following verses, also, the figurative mode of address still continues. On the other hand, however, it is simpler and safer to preserve here also the unvarying signification of πίστις, and to consider the faith as a trust for which Paul had cared honestly, so that he had lost nothing out of his hands (comp. 2 Tim. i. 12). Bengel: "*Res bis per metaphoram expressa nunc tertio loco exprimitur proprie.*"

Ver. 8. **Henceforth there is laid up,** &c. The Apostle had begun with a steadfast gaze upon his death; he now concludes, looking beyond death and the grave. Ἀπόκειταί μοι; the prize is laid up for me; it is there already for me, and cannot possibly escape me (comp. Col. i. 5; 1 Peter i. 4).—

The crown of righteousness; the crown of victory, as for the winner in the race. The crown of righteousness is not the crown deservedly *merited*, but entirely like that of *life* or *of glory*, which consists therein that one become actually full *partaker* of the δικαιοσύνη; *i. e.*, of the righteousness which is by faith.—**Which the Lord**—Jesus Christ, the rewarder—**the righteous judge**—clearly a contrast with the unrighteous, worldly judge, by whose sentence he was about now to be put to death—**shall give me**—ἀποδώσει, shall present to me publicly—**at that day.** The Apostle refers to the day of the last personal Parousia of the Lord, whom now he no longer hoped to live to see on earth, while the interval between his death and that moment is rolled up into a minimum.—**And not to me only** (*sc.* will He give it), **but unto all them also that love his appearing.** Ἐπιφάνεια, here, as in Titus ii. 13; 1 Tim. vi. 14, of his second appearing, which is represented as the object of the longing desire of all the faithful (comp. Rom. viii. 23). A pregnant hint for Timothy, at the same time, that he too might obtain the crown, yet only when if, like Paul, he would persevere faithfully in his course; and likewise also an indirect encouragement to a strict following of all the admonitions which had been previously given to him. (Upon the perfect ἠγαπ. as a continuing condition, see WINER, p. 244.)

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. "*Tametsi nunc regnat Christus in cœlo et in terra, nondum tamen constat clara regni ejus manifestatio, quia potius et sub cruce latet obscurum et violenter ab hostibus oppugnatur. Ergo tum vere stabilietur ejus regnum, quum, prostratis inimicis et omni adversaria potestate vel sublata vel in nihilum redacta, suam majestatem proferet;*" Calvin.

2. Noticeable also in a psychological view is the stress which Paul, just towards the end of his life, lays upon the promoting of Christian gentleness. He himself, in these two Epistles, gives many examples of it, and stands before us here as a John the Baptist, who, gradually, is glorified entirely into a John the Evangelist. In the more recent history of the Church, also, men are not wanting who, without sacrificing any one essential principle, any one sacred conviction, have gradually become gentler and more tender-hearted; *e. g.*, Adolphe Monod.

3. The obligation to fulfil, in all particulars, the office of an evangelist, in widely extended and large congregations especially, is so vast, that assuredly the question arises with many among us, in 2 Cor. ii. 16. Hence, the correctness generally of the *non omnia possumus omnes* must be recognized also in this sphere; and it is to be much deplored, that it be demanded of so many a clergyman to be at the same time preacher, pastor, and catechist, not to mention once the continued study of theology as science, or ecclesiastical administration. By a more equal distribution of the work, especially in a field where many colleagues co-operate, we might be able to remedy many evils, if attention only were directed especially to each particular character. But as matters now stand, that of every one strictly everything is required, it is best to ascertain, by conscientious self-examination, which is our strong and which our weak side, and then, while we neglect entirely no department of the ministry, to devote ourselves for the most part to that branch to which we feel ourselves, outwardly and inwardly, most strongly called.

4. The cry of victory with which Paul greets his approaching end, has always justly been considered one of the noblest proofs of his true apostolic greatness. It is marvellous criticism, to which the feeling effusion of his heart, in vers. 6–8, appears contradictory, either with the representation of his doctrine of grace elsewhere (De Wette), or with the humility which he displays in other places; *e. g.*, 1 Cor. iv. 3; Phil. iii. 12–14 (Baur). Whosoever is sufficiently unpartisan *to wish* to see, will readily perceive that Paul expects no other reward than that which is accorded to him of grace; and that the glory of his hope, far from ending in himself, presupposes and requires the deepest humility; which, *e. g.*, 1 Tim. i. 16 has expressed. In a comparison of this language with his earlier statements, we must not forget, moreover, that we have here his latest account of his hope for eternity, wherein all other tones of the symphony are blended in the loftiest and most beautiful, viz., in that of the assurance of hope. Here also the word, so often forgotten, applies: *Distingue tempora, et concordabit scriptura.*

5. The expectation which faith of and for the Parousia of the Lord must cherish, is, in so far as the chief subject-matter is concerned, unalterably the same as in the days of Paul, although the general expectation, in the apostolic age, of a *speedy* return, has not been realized in *that* form.

6. The affectionate longing for the appearing of the Lord in glory, presupposes a high degree of spiritual life; and, on the other side, is admirably fitted to nourish, to perfect, to purify that life.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The Christian fidelity of Timothy in his sacred calling strengthened by a glance: (1.) At the advent of the Lord; (2.) at the increasing corruption of the times; (3.) at the approaching end of Paul.—The Saviour of the world is at the same time ordained to be its Judge.—The connection of the individual judgment, directly at and after death, with the universal world-judgment at the end of the ages.—The coming again of Jesus the complete manifestation of His kingly glory.—The union of earnestness and love in the right-minded servant of Christ.—To contend is sometimes, to be gentle is always necessary.—Ebb and flow in public sympathy for sound doctrine.—Church-going from idle curiosity over against that for true desire of good.—The opposition to evangelical truth (vers. 3, 4): (1.) Its signs; (2.) its sources; (3.) its consequences.—The unworthy strife for human applause upon the part of the preacher of the gospel.—"Preach so that thou mayest please God."—The true Christian sobriety in the minister of the gospel.—Suffering and striving heroism intimately united together.—The true Christian fidelity in office: (1.) True, in the greatest matters as in the smallest; (2.) true, in the consciousness of a holy calling.—Paul at the close of his life.—The retrospect glance and the look into the future of the great Apostle, at the end of his life.—The τετέληκα of Paul a fruit of the τετέλεσται of Jesus.—The dying strains of the departing ambassador of the cross.—The similarity and the diversity between the departure of Paul and the departure of Moses.—The greatness of Paul in his farewell to life. He stands here before us: (1.) As a prisoner, who expects his

release; (2.) as a combatant, who surveys the strife; (3.) as a victor, who awaits his crowning; (4.) as an ally, who encourages his comrades.—The Christian according to the chief particulars: (1.) Placed on the same battle-ground; (2.) assured of the same victory; (3.) called to the same crown; (4.) filled with the same peace, as the great Apostle of the heathen.—The farewell of Paul a manifestation of the power of his faith, his hope, his love.—The death of the Christian a gentle release.—How much one can lose in case of necessity if one only keep the faith.—The connection between the doctrine of free grace and of just reward.—The crowning festival of eternity: (1.) The judge; (2.) those crowned; (3.) the feast of joy.—The Christian longing after the advent of the Lord: (1.) How high it rises; (2.) how suitable it is; (3.) how richly it pays.—Each true disciple of Christ has in his nature somewhat apocalyptic.—Even in heaven loneliness will be no blessedness.

STARKE: CRAMER: The office of correction must be guided by discretion.—OSIANDER: a preacher must transform himself in sundry ways, as it were, now to rebuke earnestly, again to admonish kindly and gently.—CRAMER: The naughtiness of human nature is so great, that it will only hearken to what is new; therefore the old truth is crushed out, and falsehood established.—STARKE: Preachers are placed by God as watchmen, therefore must they hold faithful watch of the congregations over which they are placed.—LANGII *Op.*: Every upright preacher must be an evangelist.—God still yet grants to many souls the especial grace to see beforehand certainly and to speak of the time of their death, which contributes so much the more to a better preparation for it; yet no one must depend upon that, nor expect it, but hold himself in readiness at all times for a blessed departure.—CRAMER: A Christian knight must (as the ancients have remarked) have three hearts: a Job's heart, for patience in affliction (1 Peter iv. 1); a Jacob's heart, for perseverance in prayer (Gen. xxxii. 37); a David's heart, for joyfulness and trust in God (Ps. xviii. 30).—It is no sin to say, in simplicity, what is best of one's self (2 Cor. xi. 18).—LANGII *Op.*: Patience, pious cross-bearer! in a little while thou becomest a crown-bearer.—Here, comfort and joy!—God will crown and glorify not only the great saints, but all likewise, provided they do but continue in faith.

HEUBNER: The spirit of the time, the prevailing taste, should not be at all the rule for the preacher; he should rather resist the spirit of the time, which for the most part is perverse.—Preachers should take for themselves an example in the prophets of the Old Covenant, who spake the truth freely to high and low.—The choice of teachers, according to what is it to be regulated?—*Gloria sequentem fugit, fugientem sequitur.*—Rash and incautious ways bring about sore mortifications.—Preaching only can avail for a complete fulfilling of the evangelical ministry.—The life of a true minister of God is a perpetual sacrifice, a giving up of himself.—The joyful looking forth upon death is the effect of a godly life.—The worth of a life rich in deeds.—For the true champion, death is a victory.—The expectation at death should strengthen for the battle and the race.

RIEGER (vers. 7, 8): How the end of Christianity is better than its beginning: (1.) The beginning is good; (2.) the continuation is better; (3.) constancy to the last best of all.—LISCO: The retrospect of a faithful pastor over his course.—The prospect of the believer in eternity.—The true minister, and his reward.

N. B.—Vers. 6–8 appropriate especially for funerals, as also for funeral addresses, but not indeed for every one.

IX.

Last Wishes, Directions, and Salutations.

CH. IV. 9–22.

9, 10 Do thy diligence to come shortly after me: For Demas hath forsaken
me, having loved this present world, and is departed unto Thessalonica; [,]
11 Crescens to Galatia,[1] Titus unto Dalmatia. Only Luke is with me. Take Mark,
12 and bring[2] him with thee: for he is profitable to me for the ministry. And
13 Tychicus I have sent to Ephesus. The cloke that I left at Troas with Carpus,
when thou comest, bring *with thee* and the books, *but* especially the parchments.
14 Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil [laid many evil charges against
15 me]; the Lord reward[3] [will reward?] him according to his[4] works: Of whom
16 be thou ware also; for he hath greatly withstood[5] our words. At my first
answer no man stood with me,[6] but all *men* forsook me: *I pray God* that it
17 may not be laid to their charge. Notwithstanding the Lord stood with me,
and strengthened me; that by me the preaching might be fully known, and
that all the Gentiles might hear[7]: and I was delivered out of the mouth of the
18 lion. And[8] the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve
me unto his heavenly kingdom: to whom *be* glory for ever and ever. Amen.

19, 20 Salute Prisca and Aquila, and the household of Onesiphorus. Erastus

21 abode at Corinth: but Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick. Do thy diligence
to come before winter. Eubulus greeteth thee, and Pudens, and Linus, and
22 Claudia, and all the brethren. The Lord Jesus[9] Christ *be* with thy spirit.
Grace *be* with you. Amen.[10]

[1] Ver. 10.—[Cod. Sin. is peculiar here—γαλλίαν; so, too, C.—E. H.]
[2] Ver. 11.—[Tischendorf reads ἄγαγε, after A. Lachmann, ἄγε; so Cod. Sin.—E. H.]
[3] Ver. 14.—[See our Author's exposition. He adheres, with Tischendorf, to the *Recepta*, ἀποδῴη. Lachmann, after weighty authorities and Greek Fathers, reads ἀποδώσει; so the Cod. Sin. and Wordsworth.—E. H.]
[4] Ver. 14.—[αὐτοῦ; left out of the Cod. Sin.—E. H.]
[5] Ver. 15.—[ἀνθέστηκε. Lachmann, after A. C., and others, ἀντέστη; so Cod. Sin., Wordsworth, and is adopted by Huther.—E. H.]
[6] Ver. 16.—[συμπαρεγένετο. The weight of testimony is in favor of παρεγένετο; so Lachmann and Cod. Sin.—E. H.]
[7] Ver. 17.—[Modern critical editors have adopted the plural form, ἀκούσωσιν, instead of the singular, as in the *Recepta*.—E. H.]
[8] Ver. 18.—[καί in this place to be omitted.]
[9] Ver. 22.—[Instead of the reading of the *Recepta*, ὁ κύρ. Ἰησ. Χριστός, Lachmann has, ὁ κύρ. Ἰησοῦς, which Huther defends. Tischendorf, ὁ κυριος simply; so, too, the Cod. Sin. Wordsworth retains the reading of the *Recepta*.—E. H.]
[10] Ver. 22.—[ἀμήν not genuine.—E. H.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 9. **Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me.** After the glance into future glory, the eye of the Apostle reverts once more to the present, with its comparatively petty cares and concerns. He has yet a great number of little commissions and wishes as a last testament, which meanwhile open to us a deep insight into the heart of the testator. First, he desires to see Timothy with him (comp. chap. i. 4; iv. 21). Perhaps Tychicus had already (ver. 12) conveyed to him the same wish. The occasion of this was in the absence of so many who had been at Rome, but who had now gone away (ver. 10). It is a genuine human feeling in the Apostle which awakens his desire to have near him, at the approach of the last conflict, his best-beloved friends. The Lord himself had likewise expressed the same need (Matt. xxvi. 38).

Ver. 10. **For Demas hath forsaken me.** Literally, left in the lurch (comp. ver. 16 and 2 Cor. iv. 9). The aorist participle ἀγαπήσας gives the reason of the apparently strange conduct, but contains also, at the same time, an indirect warning to Timothy.—**Having loved this present world,** τὸν νῦν αἰῶνα; *i. e.*, the earthly, visible world, with its good things, in opposition to the invisible, still future kingdom of Christ, which was the object of the highest love of Paul, and for the sake of which he endured willingly the heaviest affliction.—**And is departed unto Thessalonica.** According to some, to carry on trade there; according to others, because it was his native town. According to Col. iv. 14; Phil. 24, he was with the Apostle as colaborer at the time of his *first* imprisonment, and seems also to have accompanied him again just after his release. But now the prospect of the approaching death of Paul appears to have awakened in him again the desire of earthly comfort. According to the tradition (DOROTHEUS, *Synopt.*), he became an idol's-priest in Thessalonica; which, however, is not very probable. The text, at least, gives no sort of occasion for supposing an immediate falling away from Christianity. It could not have been difficult, moreover, for men like Demas to hold on to their easy Christianity in such way that they ran no risk either of being troubled by persecution, or of being compelled to offer too great sacrifice.—**Crescens**—otherwise wholly unknown—**to Galatia, Titus to Dalmatia** (comp. Rom. xv. 19), a province of Roman Illyricum, on the Adriatic, southerly of Liburnia (see WINER, *Real Wört.*, on this place). It may be that these last journeys were made in consequence of an apostolic order, at least with Paul's knowledge and approval. From the brevity of the expression, it is not possible to determine anything here with certainty.

Ver. 11. **Only Luke is with me.** Assuredly no other than the author of the gospel, and of the Acts of the Apostles (comp. Col. iv 14; Phil. 24.). The question (De Wette) where Aristarchus was then, disappears when we distinguish correctly between the Apostle's companions during his first and his second imprisonment. "The Apostle's helpers did not come to him at Rome to remain with him, but to depart again from him, and execute his orders;" Otto.—**Take Mark, and bring him with thee.** He also, according to Col. iv. 10, had been with Paul at Rome during the first imprisonment: where he was then, is unknown; probably near Timothy. According to the almost generally received view, we have here John Mark, who formerly (Acts xiii. 13) had not shown enough constancy, and upon this account was thought by Paul to be unfit to accompany him upon his second journey, but afterwards, not only in the estimation of Barnabas, but of Paul also, had shown himself far more trustworthy, so that now his presence has become properly more desirable to the Apostle than that of others.—**For he is profitable to me for the ministry,** εἰς διακονίαν. The absence of the article must not be disregarded. The ministering of the gospel in general is not meant here, but service to be done personally to Paul (πρεσβύτης, Phil. 9); certainly in his high calling, in so far as he could carry this on in prison.

Ver. 12. **And Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus.** Tychicus, co-worker with Paul (comp. Acts xx. 5; Titus iii. 12). According to Col. iv. 7; Eph. vi. 21, during Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, a commission to Ephesus was entrusted to him, which must have been distinct from this. That Tychicus was the bearer of the Epistle before us (Wieseler), we consider not probable; rather, we might conjecture that he was sent by Paul to Ephesus in advance of the latter, to take the place of Timothy during his absence, so that the latter could leave his post for an indefinite time, all the more easily, according to the wish of the Apostle, and betake himself as soon as possible to Rome. Other conjectures see in De Wette.

Ver. 13. **The cloke that I left . . . bring (with thee).** Τὸν φελόνην (according to other MSS., φαιλώνην, φαιλόνην, φελώνην), *pænulam*. Ac-

cording to some interpreters, a *travelling* cloak in the strict sense of the term; according to others, a portmanteau, portfolio, bookcase. The grammatical grounds for both views are about equal. Against the first, it is urged that it is not probable Paul would have left behind a travelling cloak at the outset, or during the progress of a missionary journey; against the second, that he means especially the βιβλία. Besides (Calvin): "*Quæret hic quispiam, quid sibi velit Paulus vestem petendo, si mortem sibi instare sentiebat. Hæc quoque difficultas me movet, ut de arcana accipiam,*" although he adds, by way of precaution: "*Potuit tamen aliquis esse tunc usus vestis, qui hodie nos latet.*" If Paul hoped to live through the winter (ver. 21), it could well be that such an article of clothing might be wished for. [Is it not true in fact, and psychologically worth noting, that even when men know they must die soon, and are entirely resigned to death, nevertheless they frequently speak of things, and of their affairs, as if they expected life to move on as usual? And is not this the true solution of St. Paul's words in this passage, which have *moved* not only the great Calvin, but many lesser lights and plain people?—E. H.] Of more moment is the account that he had left the **φελόνην with Carpus** (beyond this not known), **at Troas.** It is very improbable that the same sojourn at Troas is here meant of which there is mention in Acts xx. 6, since this happened years before, and the effects here named could readily have been conveyed upon the ship in which they were then carried from Troas to Assos (ver. 13). Paul, consequently, must have been once again at Troas, later; and here, consequently, we have a new proof of the probability of a second imprisonment. —**And the books;** uncertain whether sacred or secular writings, which were written upon papyrus (but) **especially the parchments,** μάλιστα τὰς μεμβράνας; naturally, *written* parchments, the content of which was dear to him; since unwritten parchment was readily enough to be obtained in Rome.

Ver. 14. **Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil.** ["ἐνεδείξατο = *fecit publicè;*" Wordsworth. The same writer thinks the Apostle is speaking here not of the first law-suit at Rome, "but of some more recent peril in Asia."—E. H.] Wherefore, we can*not* believe this to have been the same Alexander mentioned in 1 Tim. i. 20 (see upon this place). Were he the same mentioned in Acts xix. 33, we might conjecture that he had been summoned to Rome in the matter of Paul's law-suit, that in his first apology (ver. 16) had appeared against him, and now had returned again to Ephesus, in the immediate neighborhood of Timothy (Wieseler). Other opinions see in De Wette upon this place. In any event, the bitter mortification experienced by Paul at his hands must have been of formidable, serious sort, and consisted in a withstanding (contradiction) of his words (ver. 15).—**The Lord reward him according to his works,** ἀποδῴη. The effort to free the Apostle here from the appearance of excessive harshness, has given occasion to an alteration of the reading. A. C. D.[1] E. F. G., as well as many translators and church-fathers, read ἀποδώσει, the Lord *will* requite him according to his works. How weighty soever this number of witnesses be, observation has justly called forth some complaint nevertheless that there has been here designedly a softening of the sense of the word, so that the *Recepta*, in the end, has more inner probability. The Apostle utters here no vindictive judgment, but an imprecation which springs from his Christian feeling for right and righteousness, where, under no circumstances, must it be forgotten that he has to deal, not with a personal enemy, but with an opponent of his word (ver. 15), and of the cause of the gospel, as in Acts xiii. 9, 10.

Ver. 15. **Of whom be thou ware also; for he hath greatly withstood our words.** The soberness of this advice and the resoluteness of this accusation is the best evidence that Paul, in the foregoing words, had been in no degree blinded by personal revenge. The connection with the statements in vers. 15 and 16 strengthens the conjecture that Alexander *withstood* (ἀνθέστηκε) the words of the Apostle, not during any previous ministerial activity, but on the occasion of his recently delivered defence, when Paul was defending not only his personal cause, but assuredly, for the most part, the cause of the gospel.

Ver. 16. **At my first answer no man stood with me,** Οὐδείς μοι συμπαραγένετο. Wolf: "Συμπαραγίνεσθαι *indicat patronos et amicos, qui alios, ad causam dicendam, vocatos, nunc præsentia sua, nunc etiam oratione adjuvare solebant*" (comp. Schömann, *Att. Recht*, p. 708). According to Roman law, such assistance was perfectly legal, and allowed the accused. Even Roman emperors were accustomed not to shun their friends when arraigned. Lucian (*De Morte Peregrini*, § 13) derided the zeal of the early Christians who availed themselves of this right. If any one, surely Paul might have expected that, upon the bench of the advocate, friends would not have been wanting who would freely have raised their voices in his behalf. To be sure, some had gone away (ver. 11); but he was at Rome then for the second time, and he had various, and, amongst them, distinguished friends (see Phil. i. 13; iv. 22), consequently others could not have been wanting to him. But here, likewise, human weakness, and fear of becoming involved in the probably unfavorable issue of his suit, had prevailed in full force. It is hence likewise clear that his condition now was entirely different from that during his former imprisonment.—**(I pray God) that it may not be laid to their charge,** adds the Apostle, in the consciousness, *on the one hand*, that an actual sin had been committed, which certainly needed forgiveness; and, *on the other side*, that here no deliberate wickedness, like that of Alexander (vers. 14, 15), had been at work, but only weakness of the flesh. In this his gentle judgment, moreover, he exhibits likeness of the Master (Matt. xxvi. 41), whom he resembles in this, that, upon his entrance at the path of death, he found himself forsaken of his dearest friends, and yet was not alone (comp. John xvi. 32).

Ver. 17. **Notwithstanding the Lord stood with me and strengthened me.** After the mention of the dark side, the Apostle exhibits the bright side of his situation in that critical moment. *The Lord*—viz., Christ—*stood by me* (παρέστη)—with the help of the Holy Ghost (comp. Matt. x. 19, 20)—*and* (this the result of the assistance) *strengthened me* (ἐνεδυνάμωσέ με, comp. Phil. iv. 13; 1 Tim. i. 12), in that he endued me with courage and παῤῥησία. The Lord has not only done what the Apostle might have expected from his friends, but more yet.—The immediately following states the object of this benefit: **That by me the preaching**

might be fully known (*sc.* of the gospel), πληροφορηθῇ, comp. ver. 5 (without adequate grounds, some Cod. read πληρωθῇ), not only, that the preaching of the gospel through me should gain fuller confirmation and recognition, but that it should thereby reach, as it were, its *culmination*, since upon this occasion it was rung forth impressively in the capital of the world, in the ears of the *corona populi*, **and (that) all the Gentiles might hear.** The Apostle regards the witness delivered upon this occasion as the keystone of his apostolic message, and all within its reach as the core and representation of all heathen peoples (comp. Rom. x. 18; Col. i. 6).—**And I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion.** "*Multi sub nomine Leonis Nerorum intelligunt. Ego hac locutione potius generaliter periculam designari existimo, ac si diceret: ex præsenti incendio, vel ex faucibus mortis;*" Calvin. The explanation, that there is reference here to the punishment of being thrown to raging lions, is insipid (Mosheim). Whether, again, Alexander the coppersmith, or a certain Ælius Cæsareanus, a deputy of the Emperor, or also the chief accuser in the lawsuit, is here designated, is a matter wholly undecided. It must not be overlooked that here the statement is not of the *lion* himself, but of the *mouth* of the lion, and that hereby, in a figurative manner, the sum total of the dangers which, at the moment, surrounded the Apostle, can be expressed (comp. Ps. xxii. 22).

Ver. 18. **And the Lord shall deliver me, &c.** The Apostle foresees that the issue of the decisive final hearing, now imminent, might not be comparatively as favorable as that of the first hearing, from which he had gone forth unharmed; but he does not lose courage upon that account. He who has delivered him thus far out of all dangers, will do it yet again. Ὁ κύριος ῥύσεταί με ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ. In and by itself, it were possible that he here refers to ἔργα πονηρά which he himself might perhaps do, in reference to which he now, nevertheless, hopes in the Lord to be graciously delivered from (Grotius: "*Liberabit me, ne quid agam, Christiano, ne quid Apostolo indignum*"). At this high level of his spiritual development, and with death immediately before him, it is not probable that the Apostle could have felt and expressed fear in this respect, and hence the view is far more acceptable that Paul was thinking here of the ἔργα πονηρά of his *enemies* (so to say, further openings of the lion's mouth). That he nevertheless, as would appear from the tone of the words, expected no deliverance from the real danger of death, or a restoration of his former freedom, is evident from what follows immediately: **and will preserve (me) unto his heavenly kingdom;** in that kingdom which, although it be founded upon earth, and will, at the Parousia, be revealed in all its glory, is, nevertheless, here considered decidedly as in the beyond: σώσει εἰς = σώζων ἄξει με εἰς (Heydenreich). The heavenly kingdom is the receptaculum in which Paul will find complete deliverance, after, through death naturally, he shall have been transported thither. We have here consequently no other idea than in Phil. i. 23.—**To whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.** Here, too, as in Rom. ix. 5, the doxology is dedicated to Christ, through whom he enjoys this deliverance. A worthy conclusion of this entire passus of the whole Epistle, to which, moreover, only a few more particulars of less importance will be further added. "*Doxologiam parit spes, quanto majorem res;*" Bengel.

Ver. 19. **Salute Prisca and Aquila** (see Acts xviii. 2; Rom. xvi. 3; 1 Cor. xvi. 19). Here also, as it often occurs, Prisca is named before her husband. It may perhaps be considered a proof that she was his superior, either as regards character or in respect of the development of her spiritual life.—**And the household of Onesiphorus** (see chap. i. 16–18).

Ver. 20. **Erastus abode at Corinth, &c.**—Besides here, Erastus is also mentioned in Acts xix. 22 and in Rom. xvi. 23, as chamberlain of the city of Corinth (*arcarius civitatis*, or financial administrator). Yet it is a question whether the person here alluded to is the same as the one last mentioned. The very saying that he *abode* at Corinth speaks against it, since from οἰκονόμος this would surely have been self-evident, unless, indeed, he had already resigned his office, or, perhaps, had been deposed for his avowal of Christianity.—**But Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick.** From Acts xx. 4; xxi. 29, we are acquainted with Trophimus as a Christian from among the heathen, also an occasional travelling companion of Paul, and the innocent cause of that storm which then arose against the Apostle. This time, also, he had wished to accompany Paul on his journey, but had been left by him sick at Miletus, a city on the seacoast of Caria (not the Miletus in Crete). A statement again, which remains inexplicable if we assume that this Epistle was written during the Apostle's first imprisonment at Rome, since it is surely impossible to place this incident in that last journey to Jerusalem mentioned in Acts xx. and xxi. (see Acts xxi. 29). Well says De Wette: "The idea of *leaving* refers to a prior companionship."

Ver. 21. **Do thy diligence to come before winter** (see ver. 9). "*Ipsa hieme navigatio olim fere nulla, et imminebat martyrium Pauli;*" Bengel.—**Eubulus greeteth thee . . . and all thy brethren.** Names of certain Christians of Rome, of whom we know nothing.—**Linus**, according to some writers, is the same person whom Eusebius and Irenæus name the first Bishop of Rome. [The tradition was generally received.—E. H.]

Ver. 22. **The Lord . . . be with thy spirit.** A blessing differing somewhat in form from the conclusion usual to the Apostle. In the knowledge that it is his last Epistle, he has purposely so divided the blessing that the former part concerns Timothy alone (μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματός σου), but the latter, all the believers with him who would read it (μεθ' ὑμῶν). See 1 Tim. vi. 21.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. We are now at the end of the last Epistle which the Apostle Paul wrote, and are therefore of necessity urged to cast a glance upon his end. It is uncertain whether his last wish was fulfilled, and whether Timothy did come to him before the winter. Nero died in the June of 68 A. D.; so that, if we assume, with the tradition, that Paul suffered martyrdom under his reign, we have then in this date the extremest *terminus ad quem*. His rank as Roman citizen saved him from crucifixion, which, according to the prophecy (John xxi. 18), fell to Peter's lot. By the testimony of Clem. Rom., Tertullian, Eusebius, and others, Paul was beheaded

with the sword. JEROME (*Catal. Script.*) relates: "*Hic ergo decimo quarto Neronis anno, eodem die, quo Petrus, Romæ pro Christo capite truncatus sepultusque est in via Ostiensi.*" [Comp. Conybeare and Howson on St. Paul's death, vol. ii. pp. 486–490.—E. H.] The sentence last added is by no means improbable, if we reflect that death-warrants were often executed without the city when extensive popular tumults arising from them were feared, although, otherwise, execution without the city was thought especially shameful. Those legends need in this place no criticism, which report that milk instead of blood flowed from the neck of the Apostle; nor those others, that from the spot where the head, in falling, touched three times the ground, there leaped up springs of water.

2. The last wishes, regulations, and blessings of the Apostle before his death are of double importance. In the first place, they show that we do not stand here upon the soil of abstract ideas, but of the soberest historical reality; and, secondly, they contain, just in the seeming unimportance of many of the notices, one indirect proof more of the genuineness of the Epistle. How could a forger have devised an order like the one concerning, for instance, the cloak, the books, and the parchments? But he who wishes in any case to find straightway, in the innocent name "Linus"—only mentioned here by the way—a sign of the second century, and makes this salutation a basis for groundless hypotheses and hypercritical combinations (Baur), must certainly cling very closely to his once-assumed *fixed idea.* It is to be hoped, too, that the opinion (WIESELER, *Chron. Syn.*, p. 428) will find no general support, that in deciding upon the composition and arrangement of the apostolic Epistles, the personal references are of no importance.

3. Just that genuinely human trait which appears in Paul's longing for his friends before death, and is expressed in his sorrow for the faithlessness of certain ones, shows us that the state of his mind (vers. 6–8) can in no way be called a fruit of enthusiasm and exaggeration.

4. The little we know of Demas gives us no right to use him, as he already has been, as evidence against the evangelical precept of the *perseverantia sanctorum.* The word of the Apostle, 1 John ii. 19, is rather of weight in this case. The use Bunyan has made of this character in his "Christian Pilgrim," is ingenious. We may say, in fine, that when in us, or in others, only feeble germs even of spiritual activity are found, the consideration of Demas stimulates our vigilance; while a glance at Mark (ver. 11; compare with this his earlier history) quickens our courage. The former reminds us of the saying: "Many who are first shall be last;" and the latter: "and the last shall be first."

5. Upon the difficulty which has been found in ver. 13, against the Theopneusty of the Apostle, compare what has been said on 1 Tim. v. 23, in "Doctrinal and Ethical."

6. The account that Paul left Trophimus sick at Miletus, is, in the first place, an internal proof of the genuineness of the Epistle; for no wonder-loving forger would ever have written thus, in the Apostle's name; but secondly, also, it is a remarkable aid to a true judgment of the Apostle's power to perform miracles, which was just as little unlimited on the one hand as wholly arbitrary on the other. "We may herein also notice the wonder-working power of the Apostles, namely, that its use lay not in their own will, but in that of God; and that when miracles were to occur, they were especially urged thereto by God; and that they were used, too, only as introductory to the preaching of the gospel, and as confirmatory of it, but, for the rest, not in rivalry with the mystery of the Cross and its passion, so that this might be dispensed with at will, by means of miracles wrought upon our enemies;" Starke.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Demas, in the New Testament, is like Lot's wife in the Old.—Even when beginning to give ourselves up to Christ, return to the present world is (1.) possible; (2.) criminal; (3.) disastrous.—The faithlessness of earthly friends compared with the fidelity of the heavenly friend.—Moreover, timely regulations at the approach of death are by no means unworthy of the Christian, of whom the greatest things are demanded.—Paul was as far removed from a spiritless materialism as from a sickly spiritualism.—The spirit of order should animate the Christian even in little things.—The thought of an approaching end should not weaken, but, on the contrary, strengthen our zeal to "work while it is yet day."—"The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up" (John ii. 17).—How a Christian can be angry, and yet not sin (Eph. iv. 26).—The consolation arising from belief in God's justice notwithstanding every wrong man does us.—Alone, and yet not alone. At our last account also, no one will stand by us except the Lord.—The Lord can redeem His children *through* death, if he does not redeem them *from* death.—The last closing note of the Christian life a doxology always.—The association of the saints should be more intimate the shorter the lifetime becomes.—Aquila and Priscilla the model of Christian wedlock: (1.) Closely bound together; (2.) zealous in labor; (3.) richly blessed (*Traurede*).—The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ in its all-surpassing value.

"How joyous am I here below!
My treasure is the A and O,
Beginning and conclusion."

STARKE: HEDINGER: How many brothers Demas has, who love the world better than God (Luke viii. 13)!—CRAMER: Not he who has begun well, but he that shall endure to the end, shall be saved (Matt. xxiv. 13).—OSIANDER: Many a one is at first weak in his charge, but afterwards zealous in the work of the Lord. Hence we should not straightway despise the weak, but hope for improvement (Rom. xiv. 1).—Preachers must have books and paper; reading and writing is their labor. Without these they can hardly exist (1 Tim. iv. 13).—HEDINGER: A coppersmith withstands Paul, God, Christ's kingdom and word. Thus the enemy can work by means of insignificant people. One fly defiles much ointment, one mangy sheep many others (Eccl. ix. 18; x. 1). One bad man, when subject to the devil, can prevent much good by word and deed. May God reprove Satan, that he hold his peace!—Imperfections and faults occur even among saints; wherefore we should edify and improve each other in common (Gal. vi. 1; Matt. xxvi. 56).—When all our friends, when father and mother forsake us, our God will not forsake us (Ps. xxvii. 10).—Experience brings hope with it; he who has been so often in peril, and has been saved—who feels, too, every day

the saving help, can surely be of good hope that the Lord will always save him.—A blessed death shuts the door on every suffering.—Remember your benefactor, and, if you can do no more, wish him a thousand different benefits forever and ever.—To be blessed by the holy, is honor and benefit.—Jesus Christ all in all. Where He is not, we can accomplish no good.

HEUBNER: If even a Paul experienced bad faith from his friends, how much easier for us to find consolation!—Hints on the value and use of books, on lectures, and scientific occupations.—There is a holy longing to see evil punished for the sake of good.—It is often wise to turn aside from your path.—Let us be considerate and gentle with human weaknesses.—The aid of God is assured to the witnesses of truth.—The godly need not fear even the cruelest violence.—The final redemption of the godly is not here, but will be there.—Even with the dignity of an apostle, intimate friendship is compatible.—"Not to strange means, but to yield to God's law" (see 20 b).

LISCO: Paul's trust in God in his last extremity.—The Lord our guard and aid: (1.) He stays when men leave us; (2.) He protects us; (3.) He redeems us in the end.—Want of love, and love in its origin and action.

THE END OF II. TIMOTHY.

THE

EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO

TITUS.

BY

J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR IN ORDINARY OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF UTRECHT.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, WITH ADDITIONS,

BY

GEORGE E. DAY, D.D.,

PROFESSOR IN YALE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER & CO., 654 BROADWAY.
1870.

Stereotyped by
JAS. B. RODGERS,
PHILADELPHIA.

PREFACE.

THE Editor needs say but little by way of introduction to the present Commentary. Having made the profoundly interesting and difficult Epistle of which it treats a subject of considerable and special study, he feels no slight pleasure in introducing the Commentary of Dr. Moll to the English-speaking public, believing that it will be found inferior to none that have preceded it in soundness of interpretation, clear conception of the scope and purpose, and hearty sympathy with the spirit and doctrines of the Epistle. Its Exegetical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical parts will be found alike rich and valuable. The Exegetical portions, indeed, sometimes very full, might in other instances be advantageously expanded, especially where turning on points of view which are more familiar to the German than the American student. On many of these, as of other points, the Translator has ventured to add annotations, sometimes selected, but chiefly original, sometimes by way of illustrating the view of Moll, sometimes giving his own dissenting opinion. To the Doctrinal and Homiletical portions he has made no additions whatever, except to enrich the Homiletical parts with a few of the rich treasures of spiritual thought accumulated on the pages of Owen.

In the textual notes the Editor has pursued a slightly different plan from that adopted in the other volumes of this work. He has given first in a body the critical notes of the author, with such occasional additions as he deemed necessary, and then followed these with his own brief, chiefly philological notes, intended mainly, though not exclusively, to point out the variations from the common English version which would be demanded, or suggested by the original. Of course, the suggestions thus made are not to be judged from the point of view of their fitness for a popular translation, but simply as aids to the study of the original text. These notes in many cases the Editor would have been glad to amplify: the necessity of the case has made them brief. It is scarcely necessary to add that *all* the Editor's notes are in brackets, and where they extend beyond two or three words, are marked with his initial K., except those which are given as quoted, and accredited to their author. The majority of the Exegetical notes are incorporated into the body of the text, the translator deeming that thus they would be more likely to be read in their place, than if transferred, in a smaller type, to the foot of the page.

The translator unhesitatingly concurs with Dr. Moll in the view now acquiesced in by nearly all scholars, which looks elsewhere than to the Apostle Paul for the authorship, at least as to its form, of this Epistle. Without derogating in the slightest degree from the canonical authority and the intrinsic excellency of the Epistle, he regards the evidence, partly external and partly internal, of its non-Pauline origin, as overwhelming and decisive. He believes, too, that the suffrage of the Christian world will concentrate itself more and more upon Apollos.

The Editor, finally, commits the work to the Christian public with the assurance that (whatever may be the value of his own additions) the Commentary of Dr. Moll will be found, in its Exegetical, Doctrinal, and practical features, eminently worthy of the valuable work of which it forms a part, and an important addition to the resources of the English student of the Scriptures. May the Spirit of Truth bless it to the spiritual interests of the Church.

ROCHESTER, March 1, 1868.

THE EPISTLE

TO THE

HEBREWS.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1.—CANONICAL POSITION AND AUTHORITY.

Marvellous and enigmatical phenomenon—this production at once so obscure in its origin, and so clear and full in its knowledge and recognition of Jesus Christ; already, on the very threshold of the history of the Church, engaged in a conflict with tendencies to apostasy from the Christian faith! Uttering its teachings from an Apostolical fulness of spirit, yet directly traceable to no Apostle; with prophetic lips threatening, alarming, prophesying, yet this neither in apocalyptic vision, nor in ecstatic trance! In its loftiest rhetorical flight still mindful of the goal; though receiving at second hand, yet independent in its conception of the Gospel of Jesus, the Christ: peculiar in expression, intermediate in its mode of apprehending the Gospel between Paul and John: known to the earliest fathers, and yet of unsettled canonical position and authority: with the force of deepest conviction declaring the merging and swallowing up of the Old Covenant in the New, and that under forms of argumentation drawn entirely from the institutions and utterances of the Old Testament itself: directed to Hebrew Christians in the purest Greek of the New Testament: prompting the inquiry whether treatise or epistle; giving no certain clue to its immediate origin or destination:—thus stands, Melchisedec-like, before our eyes, with the seal of a spiritual anointing on its brow, this wondrous portraiture of the all-illuminating glory of the New Covenant, and of its Theanthropic Founder!

From what cause now should such a production be involved in doubt regarding its canonical validity? In most MSS. it stands at the close of the Pauline Epistles. In the Peshito-Syriac version, indeed, which originated probably (EWALD, *Hist. of the Israel. Nation*, vii., 449) soon after the middle of the Second Century, it stands *without* the name of any author; then *with the name of Paul*, in the Greek MSS., and in the translations made under the influence of the Greek Church. In the *Cod. Sinaiticus* discovered by Tischendorf, and published 1863, and in some other MSS., it has its place even immediately *before the Pastoral Epistles*, in accordance with the Canon 60 of the Council of Laodicea between 343 and 381; as early as in the Sahidic or Upper Egyptian version it stands exceptionally after the Second Epistle to the Corinthians; in the Codex B. after that to the Galatians.

Luther, on the contrary, places it after the Epistles of Peter and John, and distinguishes it, along with the Epistles of James and Jude and the Revelation, from "the certain, clearly authenticated leading books of the New Testament," (*Works* by WALCH, xiv. 146 f.). This proceeding of Luther springs from his false interpretation of the passages—ch. vi. 4 f.; x. 26 f.; xii. 17, in which he found a "hard knot that seems, in its obvious import, to run counter to all the Gos-

pels and Epistles of St. Paul." Apart from this he regards it as "an Epistle of exquisite beauty; discussing from Scripture, with masterly skill and thoroughness, the priesthood of Christ, and interpreting on this point with great richness and acuteness the Old Testament." Moreover, he employs the Epistle variously in argumentation in the same way as the acknowledged writings of the Apostles. For "he who wrote it is unknown, and wished, doubtless, for a while, to remain unknown; *but this is a matter of no importance. We should rest satisfied with the doctrine* which he so constantly bases upon the Scripture, showing, at the same time, a subtle tact and moderation in reading and dealing with Scripture." In the same way Melancthon employs our Epistle, although he rejects its Pauline authorship; in like manner, also, the Symbolical books of the Lutheran Church, which, in using it, adduce the name of no author, but, instead of this, simply the "writing" or "Epistle to the Hebrews," and only in the *Formula Concordiæ*, and not even here in the German original, employ the term *Apostle*. This proceeding stands connected with a change of views, in other respects also noticeable, regarding the conditions of canonicity in any alleged Scriptural production. In ecclesiastical antiquity, the question turned *on the authority of the author;* and precisely in regard to the author was there a diversity of judgment in the case of our Epistle (see § 2). For this reason not only did the later Arians, on account of its non-Pauline origin, deny its authority in matters of doctrine, but the teachers in the Latin Church also, even Novatian and Cyprian, refrained from its use until the middle of the fourth century, because up to this time the Western Church did not regard Paul as its author. AUGUSTINE adduces it, indeed, (*de doctr. Christ.* II. 8) among the canonical writings, and occasionally makes use of it; but he apologizes for it on account of the then existing opposition of some in the Western Church to the already widely-spreading conviction of its Pauline origin. Even Irenæus, of whom Eusebius relates as something remarkable (*Hist. Eccles.* v. 26), that in his βιβλίον διαλέξεων διαφόρων he has a citation from the Epistle to the Hebrews, and one from the book of Wisdom, and who (*adv. hær.* II. 30, 9), by alluding to the "word of his power," clearly indicates his knowledge of our Epistle, makes no use of it, whatever, in his refutation of the heretics. In the second Monkish Fragment (IREN. *ed. Stieren* 1, 854) Heb. xiii. 15 is, indeed, cited as an exhortation of Paul; but the genuineness of this fragment is very doubtful. And Origen, in cases where its Pauline composition is controverted, does not insist upon a recognition of its canonical authority, but either resorts for his proof passages to acknowledged canonical productions, or deems it necessary to make a special argument in favor of its composition by Paul (on Matth. ch. xxiii.; *Ep. ad African.* ch. 9). Tertullian, too, employs it in but a single instance (*de pudic.* ch. xx.), and that merely in confirmation of a point already established. *Volo tamen ex redundantia alicujus etiam comitis Apostolorum testimonium superducere.* In entire accordance with this, also more recent Scholars, *e. g.*, MICHAELIS (*Einleit. ins neue Test.* 4 ed. 2 Part, § 234) and ZIEGLER (*Complete Introd. to the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Göttingen, 1791, § 17), reject alike the hypothesis of its composition by Paul, and its canonical authority.

As early, however, as JEROME, who says, *ep.* 125 *ad Evagrium: Epistola ad Hebræos quam omnes Græci recipiunt et nonnulli Latinorum*, we find presenting itself (*Ep.* 129 *ad Dardanum*) the view, *nihil interesse cujus sit, quum ecclesiastici viri sit, et quotidie ecclesiarum lectione celebretur.* According to this now, the decision turns no longer on the name and person of the author, but on a *reception* into the canon, *ecclesiastically determined* by a Synodical decision; since, according to Can. 59 of the *Conc. Laodic.* in the 4 century, no βιβλία ἀκανόνιστα were to be read in the church. ERASMUS goes yet a step further with the declaration: *Imo non opinor periclitari fidem si tota ecclesia fallatur in titulo hujus epistolæ, modo constet Spiritum Sanctum fuisse principalem auctorem, id quod interim convenit* (Opp. ix. 595). CALVIN, who does not regard Paul as its author, still ascribes even to the cunning of Satan the denial, on the part of some, of its canonical validity, and BEZA holds decidedly to the inspiration of the author, and declares, therefore, the precise person and name to be a matter of comparative indifference. The attempt of CARLSTADT (*de canonic. Scripturis libellus, Viteb.* 1520) to distribute the books of the Old and the New Testament, according to their rank, into three classes, assigning to the first class of the New Testament books the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, to the second the thirteen Epistles of Paul, and John and Peter, and to the third the remainder, including the Epistle to the Hebrews, has failed to make converts. But since MARTIN CHEMNITZ (*Examen Conc. Trident.*)

it has been customary to speak of Apocrypha of the New Testament in the sense in which Rufinus had spoken of *libris ecclesiasticis*, and Jerome of uncanonical writings, which, like the Apocrypha of the Old Testament, *might serve for popular edification, though not for establishing the doctrines of the Church.* Among writings of this class, the Wittenberg theologians in particular, toward the end of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th centuries, reckoned the Epistle to the Hebrews, the 2d Epistle of Peter, and the 2d and 3d of John, and James, Jude and the Revelation. A revolution, however, was produced by JOHN GERHARD, who (*Loci Theolog. ed. Cotta* Vol. II.) found fault with the term 'Apocrypha,' specially on the ground that in the early church doubts regarding these portions of the New Testament were in part confined to individual teachers or churches, and in part had reference only to the *auctor secundarius.* Gerhard introduced the distinction between canonical books *primi ordinis* and *secundi ordinis*, the distinction, meantime, having a purely historical, not a doctrinal significance, and referring not to the canonical consideration, or to the inspired character of the work, but simply to the greater or less degree of confidence to be reposed in opinions regarding its author.

§ 2. HYPOTHESES REGARDING THE AUTHOR.

We encounter at first view the remarkable phenomenon that the Eastern Church, from the time of Pantænus, by testimonies almost unanimous, and apparently resting on tradition, ascribes the Epistle to Paul; while it was only after the Arian controversies that the Western Church came gradually to adopt the oriental view. And this is all the more remarkable as the Epistle sent by the Roman Church to the Corinthian, and ascribed by tradition to Clement, as the first to the Corinthians, an Epistle belonging at latest to the time of the Emperor Domitian, 87–96 (HILGENFELD, the *Apostol. Fathers*, p. 84), but by others held to have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem, makes a decided and peculiar use of our Epistle (*Euseb. H. E.* III. 28), *viz.*, without expressly citing it, or naming an author, and by interweaving its clauses, phrases and turns of expression. Since, however, this Roman Epistle does not bear a pure Pauline impress, but is merely stamped with a character *kindred* to the Pauline, its use of the Epistle to the Hebrews does not argue an assumption of the Pauline authorship of this Epistle, but would point only to some man who stood allied to Paul in Apostolic dignity. On the other hand also JUSTIN MARTYR (I. 166) twice cites our Epistle (KIRCHHOFER, *Quellensammlung*, p. 239) without designating the author; and the treatment of this question in the Alexandrian Church by PANTÆNUS, CLEMENT of Alexandria and ORIGEN (see BLEEK I. 95 ff.), shows clearly 1. that it was in that church strictly speaking only the *ideas* which were attributed to Paul; 2. that there existed, at least at the time of Origen, already various, and, in like manner, traditionary opinions, regarding the disciple of Paul to whom should be ascribed the *actual composition;* and 3. that *critical* doubts existed to which regard had to be paid, such as appear in Irenæus and his pupil Hippolitus (*Photii Biblioth. Cod.* 121 *ed. Becker*, p. 94, and the testimony of STEPHEN GOBARUS of the 6th century, *L. C. Cod.* 232, p. 291). Critical doubts like these did not prevail in the Latin Church, and scarcely even dogmatical ones. There are, indeed, distinguished scholars who, with SPANHEIM (*de auctore ep. ad. Hebr.*, Heidelberg, 1659) and Wetstein, suppose that the Western Church was actuated by hostility toward the Montanists, who appealed to ch. vi. 4, against the re-admission of the *lapsi* into the church; but even Tertullian mentions, indeed, this Epistle during his Montanistic period, but knows nothing apparently of its authorship by Paul. Cyprian makes no mention whatever of the Epistle. We might be inclined to find an explanation of this silence in his assumption of the number seven of the Pauline Churches, which should correspond to the seven churches mentioned by John, an opinion also held by VICTORINUS PETABIONENSIS (*Fragm. de fabrica mundi bei* KLEE, p. 9; *septem quoque cœli sunt—septem spiritus—septem cornua agni—septem ecclesiæ apud Paulum.*) But these writers would have ventured neither to distort nor to leave unregarded an existing tradition. J. CHRIS. VON HOFMANN thinks (*deutero canonical? in Zeitschrift für Prot. und Kirche*, Ell. 1857) that the Gentile Church of the West regarded the three Epistles to the Jewish Christians (Peter, James and Hebrews), which, in the *fragm. de canone*, published by MURATORI, do not appear among those, which the church has stamped with her approval, as in no way concerning them. But, on the one hand, the Epistle of James was even in the East an *antilegomenon;* and, on the other, 1 Peter is cited by Irenæus, Tertullian, and

Cyprian as an Apostolical composition. The Western Church has evidently no tradition ascribing the authorship of our Epistle to Paul; for even the Roman presbyter Caius, in his controversy with the Montanists, at the time of the Roman Bishop Zephyrinus in the beginning of the 3d century (Jerome *de viris ill.* ch. lix.), knows of but thirteen Epistles of Paul (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* IV. 20), and in the above-mentioned *fragm. de canone*, probably belonging to the close of the second century, there are, indeed, mentioned two spurious Epistles under the name of Paul *ad hæresem Marcionis, viz.*, to the Laodiceans and to the Alexandrians; and some interpreters regard the latter, others the former, as identical with the Epistle to the Hebrews, but both equally without reason; for while the Pauline composition of the Hebrews has been assailed, its doctrinal soundness has never been called in question. The change of views is shown clearly in the circumstance that the Synod of Hippo 393, Can. 36, and the third Synod of Carthage, (397) Can. 47 ordain; *Pauli Apostoli epistolæ tredecim; ejusdem ad Hebræos una* ("one, by the same, to the Hebrews"), while Can. 29 of the Fifth Synod of Carthage (419), simply reckons fourteen Epistles of Paul. In this case we see clearly the influence of the East in the declaration of Augustine *de peccat. mer. et remiss*, I. 27: *majis me movet auctoritas ecclesiarum orientalium, quæ hanc quoque in canonicis habent,* and through all subsequent time, we still hear the tones of occasional individual dissent from this decision. Hence, is explained also the inconsistent proceeding of Eusebius (in the first half of the fourth century). In his Commentary on the Psalms, he frequently cites our Epistle as Pauline, and reckons it (*H. E.*, II. 17) among the Epistles of Paul, as also (*H. E.* III. 3) he gives the number of the acknowledged and unquestioned Epistles of Paul as fourteen, and places the Epistle to the Hebrews (*H. E.*, III. 25) among the *homologoumena*. On the contrary, (at *H. E.*, vii.3) he places it among the *antilegomena*, and mentions it between the Wisdom of Solomon and Jesus Sirach on the one hand, and Barnabas, Clement of Rome, and Jude on the other, and says (*H. E.*, VI. 20), in confirmation of the view of Caius, that the Epistle to the Hebrews is not to be reckoned as Pauline; "since we know that up to this time it is by some of the Romans regarded as not the work of the Apostle." According to Wieseler, (*Inquiry regarding the Epistle to the Hebrews, particularly its author and its readers*, 1861) the testimony of Tertullian in favor of Barnabas as its author (*de pudicitia*, c. 20; *Extat enim et Barnabæ titulus ad Hebræos, a Deo satis auctorati viri*) stands not so entirely solitary *in the Latin Church*, as is commonly supposed. And, however questionable may be the interpretation of the passages (Philastrius, *hær.* 89, Jerome, *Ep.* 129 *ad Dardanum*, Isidorus, *Etymol.* 6, 2) in respect to the *local extent* and the continuance *in time* of the view which ascribes the Epistle to Barnabas, still it is undeniable that the statement of Tertullian must rest upon *a fact* existing within a certain circle. The hypothesis which Schmidt, Twesten, Ullmann, Wieseler (*Chronologie des Apost. Zeitalter*), Thiersch, have built on this fact, and to which recently Credner (*Hist. of the N. Test. Canon*, p. 180 ff.) has given his adhesion, is thus destitute neither of *historical*, nor in part of *traditional* support. This would be considerably strengthened if in the stichometrical list of the sacred writings of the N. Test. in the *Cod. Claromontanus*, the Epistle to the Hebrews were actually and simply designated as *Epistola Barnabæ*. But in the list this "Epistle of Barnabas" is separated from the Epistles of Paul by the Catholic Epistles, while in the codex itself the Epistle to the Hebrews is separated only by this list from those of Paul, and a separate 'Epistle of Barnabas' is found also in the *Cod. Sinaiticus*. In favor of Barnabas, the υἱὸς παρακλήσεως, may be urged (without referring to the λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως, Heb. xiii. 22), first, that his position as a disciple of the Apostles (defended by Tertullian *de pudic.* 20, against the assumption that he belonged to the 70 disciples, in Clem., Alex. *Strom.*, II. 20, comp. Euseb. *H. E.*, I. 12) accords well with Heb. ii. 3; and that he might be brought into relation with Timothy both by his accompanying Paul on his missionary journey mentioned Acts xiii. 14, and by his later interviews with the Apostle, Gal. ii. 9 ff.; secondly, that Barnabas along with Paul is called, Acts xiv. 14, ἀπόστολος, and that the Syrian Church was founded by them both (ch. xi. 22 ff.); and finally that the peculiar character of our Epistle, especially its doctrinal independence while yet resting on a Pauline basis, and the position assumed by the author alike toward the members and the officers of the church to which he writes, harmonize entirely with what we know of Barnabas. As a Levite, too, and frequently in Jerusalem, the priestly element in our Lord's character would come naturally under discussion (Acts iv. 36); and alike the purer Greek and the Alexandrian tinge

of the Epistle would be in his case both explicable from the fact that he sprang from Cyprus, which stood in intimate relations of commerce and intercourse with Alexandria. Nor need we attach importance to the fact that, according to Acts xiv. 12, Barnabas appears inferior to Paul in eloquence, since we have here not an oral address, but a carefully composed written composition; nor can we reason legitimately from the Epistle ascribed to Barnabas among the works of the Apostolic Fathers, as its genuineness is more than doubtful. Yet, on the other hand, a person brought up a Levite would scarcely express himself in the manner of our Epistle regarding the arrangements of the Levitical service and the utensils and objects belonging to the temple at Jerusalem, even granting that no positive errors in those points have crept into ch. 9; and again Gal. ii. 9, the sphere of missionary labor assigned to Barnabas seems to have lain among the Gentiles; for which reason also WIESELER, though in connection also with other grounds, is inclined to look at least beyond the limits of Palestine for the recipients of the Epistle. [It seems to me a sufficient reply to the first of these objections of the author, to say that the writer of the Epistle is not in ch. 9 speaking at all of the regulations of the ritual service of the Temple at Jerusalem, much less of the utensils, vessels, *etc.*, found in it; but simply of the arrangements and contents of the *Mosaic tabernacle*. There does not seem to be the slightest evidence that he had especially in mind the furniture of the temple of his time, as, on the contrary, in regard to most of the articles, it is certain that he could not.—K.].

The *Syrian* Church, on the contrary, although the Epistle stands in the Peshito without the name of an author, from the middle of the third century regarded the Epistle as from *Paul*. For the Council at Antioch (264) in its letter directed to Paul of Samosata, refers to Heb. ii. 14; iv. 14, 15; xi. 26, and connects the last named passage with citations from the Epistle to the Cor. as utterances of *the same* Apostle. In like manner, at a later period, EPHRAEM SYRUS (* 378), connects Heb. x. 31 with Rom. ii. 16, and Eph. v. 15, by the introductory words, "In respect to this day, exclaims also the Apostle Paul," while he elsewhere, like his teacher Jacob, Bishop of Nisibis, adduces passages of our Epistle merely in *general* terms, as words of an *Apostle*. On this point the *Egyptian* Church seems to have had a controlling influence.

Unquestionably remarkable is not merely the testimony of the Oriental Church for the Pauline composition of the Epistle, and the marked use of it by Clement of Rome, but especially the circumstance that the testimony of the Alexandrians may not (with EICHHORN, SCHMIDT, DAV. SCHULTZ) be referred back to purely hypothetical assumptions; comp. STENGLEIN *Historical Testimonies* of the first four centuries regarding the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Bamberg, 1835. True, indeed, as we have already intimated, the tradition in favor of Paul upon which PANTÆNUS, about the middle of the second century, seems to rely, is not so sure and decisive as STORR, HUG, *etc.*, imagine. And entirely justifiable is the cautious language of BLEEK, who regards it as probable, on scientific grounds, that PANTÆNUS already found different views existing in his church regarding the Author of our Epistle, and that he had reference to an objection urged against his own view in the words preserved by EUSEB. *H. E.*, VI., 14, that "Paul from modesty and a spirit of reverence toward the Lord, did not designate himself as Apostle of the Hebrews, because to the Hebrews the Lord had been sent as the Apostle of the Almighty, but he, Paul, as Apostle and Preacher to the Gentiles, had written to them gratuitously and outside of his appointed sphere of labor."

This sagacious position is needlessly surrendered in the otherwise valuable "History of the N. Test. Canon, by C. A. CREDNER, Edited by G. VOLKMAR, Berlin., 1860, p. 182," according to which Pantænus might merely have spoken the sentiments of those who, like him, wished to connect the Epistle, that had originated, perhaps, but without clearly settled authorship in the Alexandrian Church, with the name of Paul as opposed to the Catholic Church, which was disposed to contest with him its claim to canonical authority. How decided, on the contrary, was with others the consciousness and influence of a tradition *in favor of* its Pauline composition, is conspicuously evinced by the fact that the Alexandrians themselves, while observing its diversity of style from that of Paul, for this reason framed the hypothesis that the Epistle had sprung from an Aramæan original, of which Paul was the author (Clem. Alex.), or that Paul did not dictate its language, but only gave the ideas (ORIG.); while, meantime, ORIGEN concedes (EUS. *H. E.*, VI. 25) that "if any church deems this Epistle a production of Paul, it is liable to no

blame, *οὐ γὰρ εἰκῇ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς* Παῦλου *αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασιν*, ("for not without cause—not at mere hap-hazard—have ancient or the primitive men handed it down as Paul's"). This language points to a real tradition, going back to men well-known, and already to be reckoned as *ancestors*, even granting it to have been held only here and there by an individual church. And the circumstance that Origen regards this procedure as not groundless and irrational, is all the more weighty as he gives in immediate connection his own dissenting view, resting on critical grounds; *viz.*, "that should he declare his own opinion, it is this, that the thoughts belong to the Apostle, the style and composition to another, who has written down the ideas of the Apostle, and carried out in his own explanatory language the statements of his teacher." Then follow the words cited above, after which: "But who actually committed it to writing, is known to God." He adds that tradition ascribes it partly to Clement of Rome, partly to Luke.

The weight of these facts has led to successively renewed endeavors to defend the Pauline authorship of the Epistle. To this effect—after the assaults of an independent criticism commencing with SEMLER—MEYER, in the *Journal of Ammon and Bartholdt* II., 3; CRAMER, in his *Commentary;* and particularly STORR: while KLEUKER (*Extended Inquiries, etc.*, RIGA, 1793, II.) sought to show that the assumption of a Pauline authorship was at least not unreasonable. Against the assaults of Dav. Schultz appeared specially Steudel in BENGEL'S *Archiv.*, IV., 1; *Hofstede de Groot* (*disput. qua ep. ad Heb. cum Paulinis epp. comparatur, Traj. ad Rhen.*, 1826); Stuart of Andover, U. S., 1827, and HUG in the Second Ed. of his *Introd. to the N. Test.*, 1821. Even after the investigations of Bleek, the Pauline authorship was still defended by GELPKE (*vindiciæ originis Paulinæ Ep. ad Heb.*, Lugd. Bat., 1833); by Paulus in Heidelberg, 1833; by the Catholic Klee, 1833; and by STEIN in the Appendix to his *Commentary on Luke*, 1830. More recently again L. GAUSSEN (*Le canon des saintes écritures*, translated into German by PASTOR GROB, 1864) who, after WORDSWORTH (*on the Canon*, London, 1847, p. 234), finds a direct and authentic testimony in favor of Paul as its author, in the closing salutation (v. 25), in connection with a false explanation of 2 Thes. iii. 17.

Yet even the passage chap. ii. 3, taken in its connection, makes strongly against the Pauline authorship, as, since Cajetan and Erasmus, is commonly conceded. It is, indeed, true that the writer here in terms distinguishes himself properly only as a *non-eye-witness* from the actual eye-witnesses of the life of Jesus (HOFM. *Schriftbeweis*, II., 2, p. 352). The contrast of *Apostle* and *non*-Apostle is here not in question; and thus we might find in this passage, perhaps, no *formal* contradiction to Paul's uniform and studious assertion of his Apostolical authority, Gal. i., and 2 Cor. xi. xii. But no less certainly does the author class himself with his readers as belonging to a generation to which the salvation—originally uttered by the Lord—has been confirmed by the testimony of intermediate ear-witnesses. And in such a manner Paul could not have expressed himself, however much, for purposes of instruction, he might have chosen for once to hold his Apostolical claims in abeyance; for thus he would not merely have *concealed*—he would have *denied* them.

Again the *personal references* of ch. 13 contain nothing which decidedly points to Paul. True, we may not specially determine to what considerable Christian man Timothy could, during the life of Paul, have stood in any such relation of fraternal coöperation as ch. xiii. 23 indicates; and just as little can we establish the fact that he, after the death of Paul, although bishop of the Church at Ephesus, again made journeys as a missionary. But undeniably men like Luke, Barnabas, Apollos, might thus express themselves in regard to Timothy, well-known doubtless in his fortunes to the readers; and as Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 9, summons Timothy to himself from Ephesus we are not required to regard him as fixed irremovably at Ephesus. Further, against the Pauline hypothesis are the facts that the expression *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς* Ἰταλίας *they from Italy* (13, 24) philologically, to be sure, can be understood of Italians, but hardly of them *including* Romans; that the request to the readers (v. 19) to pray to God for his restoration to them, points to such a connection with the Church addressed as Paul could not have had with the Churches of Palestine; that Paul could not expect so peaceful a return after his experiences in Jerusalem; that vv. 18, 19 hardly point to an imprisonment of the author (since also at ch. x. 34, we are to read not *τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου*, but *τοῖς δεσμίοις*); and finally that we can scarcely conceive how Paul should have written to Hebrew Christians, if we remember the agreement made at Jerusalem among the

Apostles, in regard to their spheres of labor, and the declarations of Paul himself in regard to his position and the immediate duty assigned him, Rom. xv. 20; 1 Cor. x. 13. And besides, how could Paul, who elsewhere always prefixes to his letters his name and opening salutation, have written without affixing his name, and *in such terms* as at ii, 3, precisely to those churches that had sought to spread their doubts of his Apostolical authority even by their deputations to the Gentile Churches?

To these grounds of doubt we may add the important fact that, alike in its train of thought and the closely related character of its style, this Epistle stands clearly distinguished from the undoubted compositions of Paul. We may not, indeed, emphasize the doctrinal diversity so strongly as does Dav. Schultz, and in part Ed. Reuss, who even maintains that the Christology of our Epistle has a "decidedly spiritualistic tendency whereby (ἀμήτωρ) obscurity is thrown upon Christ's connection with humanity." Heb. ii. 14, 17, stands in decided hostility to this view. In general the undeniable diversities in the *doctrinal* statements can be converted into *discrepancies* only by misconception, and they are easily explicable from the character of the readers, and the special object of the Epistle. Paul, starting from the *condition and needs of humanity*, points usually to the *subjective* influences of the work of salvation, deducing thence the contrasted nature of law and Gospel, and thus leading on his readers from these phenomena, to the profounder truths of Christology. Our author proceeds by a reverse process. He deduces the infinite superiority of the New Covenant to the Old, from the *infinite elevation* of Jesus Christ above all the mediators of salvation, and all the servants and organs of Divine revelation. Paul again links the death of Christ with that of the *sacrificial victim;* here it is linked with the fact of *priestly intercession.* Paul lays the stress on that which was accomplished *on the cross;* here it is laid on that which is accomplished *in the heavenly sanctuary* by the perfected Royal Priest, who is exhibited before us in his entire personality as a sacrifice which, "through an eternal Spirit," has in a perfect manner been offered to God. Yet the words of Paul regarding the exaltation of Christ above the heavens (Eph. iv. 10), and regarding his intercession for the saints at the right hand of the Father (Rom. viii. 34), contain the germ of the doctrine here unfolded of Christ's high priesthood in the heavenly holy of holies. And in Paul's designation of the Old Test. ceremonial law as the "rudiments of the world" (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, Gal. iv. 3) lies enfolded all that is here taught regarding the inability of the law to bring anything to perfection, as, on the other hand, our Epistle is but an expansion and carrying through, in its own peculiar way, of the Pauline doctrine that Christ is the τέλος τοῦ νόμου, Rom. x. 4, and that the Law has partly a disciplinary and "pedagogical" (Gal. iii. 24), partly a typical (1 Cor. x. 11; Col. ii. 17) significance. So also at once independent, and yet standing in close relationship with Phil. ii. 7 f., is the treatment of the doctrine of the humiliation and exaltation of Jesus Christ (ch. i. 4; ii. 9), who here, as with Paul, is not merely the mediator of the New Covenant on the ground of the redemption wrought through His blood (ch. vii. 22; ix. 15; xii. 24; Gal. iii. 19; 1 Tim. ii. 5), but, as the Image of God, is also the Mediator in the creation, preservation and government of the world (ch. i. 1–3; 1 Cor. viii. 6; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Col. i. 15–17; Eph. i. 10). And in the same reciprocal relation stand the declarations (ch. vi. 1; ix. 14; comp. ix. 9) regarding dead works and their distinction from *good works*, to which Christians are mutually to incite each other (x. 24), as the Pauline distinction of works of law and good works; and faith is brought into direct relation not barely with the righteousness of man (ch. xi. 7; comp. x. 38), but also with the expiatory death of Jesus (x. 22). Any *essential* difference, therefore, must not be assumed. But here the prevailing contrast is not that between faith and law, or works of law. The conception of faith is here preponderantly the *more general* one of abiding and obedient trust in the promises of God, so that on the one hand it forms a contrast to the *vision* of the period of fulfilment (as 1 Cor. v. 7), and on the other, particularly in ch. 11, is regarded as that which from the outset has been through all ages the condition of salvation, thus simply carrying out Paul's representation (Rom. iv.) of the faith of Abraham. Precisely so the *ethical* element of faith, particularly in the life of Jesus himself, is still more expressly exhibited (ch. ii. 17; iv. 15; xii. 2). It does not lie within the scope of the Epistle to dwell on the *universality* of the plan of grace, and on the calling of the Gentiles. So also the resurrection of Jesus is but once mentioned, ch. xiii. 20; and Paul's doctrine of *sin* and *grace* is but lightly touched by the mention of the "deceitfulness of sin," iii. 13, comp. xi. 25; xii. 4; in like manner

his doctrine of χάρις, ch. iv. 16; and of deliverance" (ἀπαλλαγή), in contrast with bondage (δουλεία).

But it is not merely individual terms, expressions, and references, which exhibit a deviation from those familiar to Paul, and regarding which it might be possible to say that under like conditions, or for a like purpose, Paul would very probably have thus expressed himself. The state of the case is rather this, that along with an essential accordance with the fundamental ideas of Paul; along with the occasional recurrence of modes of thought specifically Pauline, and with a frequent use of substantially equivalent doctrinal expressions, there yet, on the one hand, runs through our Epistle a thorough independence in the modes of conception, in the style of argumentation and the diction, which precisely in minute and familiar matters, gives spontaneous expression to a writer's individuality; and, on the other, it displays here and there a decidedly non-Pauline terminology, as, *e. g.*, in the use of ἁγιάζειν and τελειοῦσθαι. A resort to the opinion of Origen, (as by Guericke, Thiersch, Bisping, Stier, Ebrard, and partly Delitzsch), which refers the *substance* of the Epistle to Paul, its *form* to one of his companions, does not explain the phenomenon, and in fact involves a superficial view that will bear no close inspection. Even OLSHAUSEN has felt (*Opusc. Theol.*, *Königsberg*, 1834, p. 118 f.) that in assuming such an indirect authorship on the part of Paul, nothing is gained, and that the *immediate composer*, standing forth in undeniable individuality, must be regarded as the proper author of the Epistle. In the endeavor, however, to maintain its outward connection with Paul, he advances the hypothesis, destitute of the slightest historical support, that the Epistle is properly a *hortatory discourse*, composed by Presbyters of a church in Asia Minor, to which Paul has lent his approval, regarding which then the writer apprises us in appending some personal notices.

We shall find it, then, advisable, in inquiring after the author of our Epistle, to leave Paul, *directly*, entirely out of the question. For the view of BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS (*On the Origin and Internal Character of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Jena, 1828), that it belongs to the class of interpolated writings, and that the Alexandrian author has designed to produce a re-moulding of the contents of the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, for the Jewish Christians, finds no shadow of support in the character of the Epistle. Equally untenable is the view of SCHWEGLER (*Post-Ap. Age*, II. p. 312) and ZELLER (*Theol. Jahr.* 1842, 1), that this is a treatise of the Pseudo-Johannean school of the second century, to which the form of an epistle is incidentally given, together with such personal references as should allow of its being referred to Paul. It is necessary, on the other hand, that our conjectures should remain within the sphere of the action and influence of Paul. The view of KÖSTLIN (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1854, *Heft* 4) and of ALB. RITSCHL, (*Origin of the Early Catholic Church*, 2 ed., Bonn, 1857), that the Epistle to the Hebrews presents an advanced stage of the primitive Apostolical Judaism, and displays but here and there traces of the Pauline spirit, can scarcely be carried through, although in the turn given to it by WEISS (*Stud. und Crit.*, 1859, I. 142 ff., and RIEHM, *Lehrbegriff*, II. 861 ff.), it assumes a more plausible form. The author appears as an independent missionary laborer among those connected with Paul, and pre-eminent in talent and influence. Hence, it does not meet the case to refer it, as a mere matter of conjecture, to Mark or Aquila; or, with BÖHME in his *Commentary*, or with MYNSTER (*Kleine theol. Schriften*, *Copenhag.*, 1825), in part also RIEHM II., 893, to Silas; or with Erasmus, and hesitatingly Calvin, and more recently Bisping, following some ancient authorities (EUSEBIUS, *H. E.* III. 38), to Clemens Romanus. To trace the authorship of the Epistle with EICHHORN, SCHOTT, BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS, SEYFFARTH (*de epistolæ quæ dicitur ad Hebr. indole maxime peculiari Leipz.*, 1821) to an Alexandrian in general, is going too far, and is mixing with the question some irrelevant considerations (see sec. 5). We might, however, if we do not decide in favor of Barnabas, be easily tempted, with Hugo Grotius, HUG, since the third edition of his *Introduction*, KÖHLER (*Essay on the Date of the Composition of the Epistles*, 1830), Ebrard and Delitzsch, to fix upon Luke. Luke alone was with Paul (2 Tim. iv. 11) when he summoned Timothy to come to him with all speed (iv. 9), and he was also with him in his last visit to Jerusalem, Acts xxi. 17. Besides this, he was, according to EUSEBIUS, *H. E.*, III. 4, 3, from Antioch, and was, hence, a sort of fellow-countryman to the Christians of Palestine. Delitzsch lays much stress on the similarity of the style to that of Luke (a similarity previously perceived by Grotius), particularly from Acts xvi. 10, which also WEITZSÄCKER (*Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.*

1862, II. 399) deems deserving a close investigation, and of which he adduces a multitude of new examples. Nay, he even finds modes of expression such as belong specially to a *physician*, (to which calling, according to Col. iv. 14, Luke belonged), particularly Heb. iv. 12 f.; v. 11 ff.; vi. 12; xii. 12 f. But LÜNEMANN (*Comm.* 2 ed.) shows that these points of relationship are comparatively slight, while one cannot fail to discover a prevailing *diversity* in style and manner. He also maintains as decisive the evidence from Col. iv. 16, that Luke was a *Gentile Christian*, against TIELE (*Stud. und Krit.*, 1858, IV. 753) and HOFMANN (*Schriftbeweis* 2 *Aufl.* II. 2, 99), who regard him as a Jewish Christian. All this makes against Luke as author of the Epistle. True, the partial errors of the author of our Epistle regarding the arrangements of the Levitical worship, assumed by most interpreters, would be easily explained under this hypothesis. But they are equally so on the theory which, since the time of Luther, has been maintained by most expositors, of its authorship by *Apollos* (Doric abbreviation of Ἀπολλώνιος). On behalf of this may be urged, first of all, that union of *independence* in his ministry with harmony with the Apostle, to which the Epistles to the Corinthians bear testimony; then the description of him given in the Acts (xviii. 24) as a born Jew and earlier disciple of John, learned and profoundly versed in Scripture, who overpowered the Jews by reasonings drawn from Scripture; the fact that, for these reasons, although by birth an Alexandrian, he, nevertheless, still appears standing in relation with Palestine, and holding himself free from the idealism of Philo, and the influences of Greek philosophy, (as indeed it was also by Aquila, one of Paul's converts, that he was introduced at Ephesus into a deeper understanding of the Gospel (Acts xviii. 2 f.); the fact that he had either been in Crete, or must have intended to come thither (Tit. iii. 13), and that he devoted his labors especially to the Jews (Acts xviii. 28); and finally, that that exclusive use of the Septuagint, which attracted notice as early as JEROME (*ad Is.* vi, 9), would, in his case, be entirely explicable. There remain, however, two grounds of hesitation. The first is, that in Christian antiquity his name is unmentioned in connection with this question. The second, that in the historical accounts regarding him, we find no proper points of support for the personal relations touched upon at the close of the Epistle. The question regarding its authorship must, therefore, still be considered as standing open.

[The question regarding the authorship of this noble Epistle, must indeed be regarded as undecided, and may very possibly ever remain unsusceptible of positive solution. The only point which may be regarded as established beyond all controversy, is, that at least *in its present form*, it did not proceed from the pen of the Apostle Paul. The diversities—discrepancies, it seems to me, are out of the question—between this Epistle and the acknowledged writings of Paul, are too numerous and too great, both in the subject-matter and the style, to render it conceivable that they should have come from the same pen. And I deem scarcely less improbable the hypothesis, that the Epistle was dictated in substance by Paul, and committed to writing in his own independent diction by another. The Epistle bears the stamp of unity; thought and diction appear in it closely and inseparably allied; and the difficulties are equally great, either of assuming that the supposed amanuensis speaks in the name of his principal, or that he speaks in his own name. Still, English and American commentators have by no means uniformly abandoned the Pauline hypothesis. In this country Prof. Stuart defended it with great zeal, if not with very great acumen, and Sampson, Turner, Dr. Barnes, and Dr. Lindsay, all maintain this view. In England Alford follows the lead of the Continental scholars, and makes an elaborate and able appeal in behalf of the claims of Apollos; Conybeare and Howson also yield entirely the Pauline authorship. Wordsworth, however, representing the conservative tendencies of the English Church, still adheres to the view that Paul was its author; but defends the position on no new or decisive grounds.—In relation to the question who *was* the author, there doubtless will continue to be, among those who conceive that it could not have been written by Paul, various opinions. The claims of Barnabas, Luke, Silas, Clemens Romanus, have been canvassed, and those of each, especially the two former, admit of many plausible and not entirely unweighty considerations in their favor. Still, they also admit of much being said against them. In regard to Barnabas, it certainly seems a mysterious dispensation of Providence—granting that the Epistle to the Hebrews is really *his* production—that he should be known to posterity as an author, by productions so nearly intrinsically worthless as the spurious Epistles that bear his

name, while with that genuine production which is one of the noblest and most precious legacies to us of the age of inspiration, his name should have but the most uncertain and shadowy connection. But in regard to all these persons, except Luke, the case is too purely hypothetical to warrant any thing more than the merest conjecture; while, in regard to Luke, noble as are the two undoubted productions of his pen, they furnish no indications of that depth of thought, and that profound knowledge of the Old Testament, which would have enabled him to write the Epistle to the Hebrews. The only name on which we can, as it seems to me, fasten and make a vigorous and solid argument, is that of *Apollos*. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was certainly a *Jew*. He was no less certainly a person of elegant culture, and trained in the arts of rhetoric; for this Epistle is full of delicate rhetorical points. He was a person of fine Greek culture, as shown by the elegance of his Greek style. He was, it seems almost certain, acquainted with the writings of the Alexandrian Philo (for the verbal coincidences are too numerous and striking to be the offspring of mere accident), though untinctured by his philosophizing and mystical tendencies; he therefore, in all probability, must have been from Alexandria. He stood as a teacher on high and independent ground, and yet did not belong to those who had received the Gospel from the Lord at first hand. He differed widely from Paul in his mode of presenting the Gospel, and was yet, in every fundamental point, in perfect harmony with him. He was profoundly versed in the Old Testament, and had precisely that power of fathoming and drawing out the deeper sense of the Old Testament, which would enable him "with great power, to convince the Jews from the Old Testament Scriptures, that Jesus was the Christ." All these requisites of the author of this Epistle are fulfilled in Apollos. If a writer should attempt to put into one or two brief sentences, all the qualifications which would be demanded for the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, he would need only to write the sentences contained in Acts xviii. 2, *etc.* Nor do I conceive that there is much force in the two counter-suggestions of Moll. It seems indeed surprising that Christian antiquity should not have suggested the name of Apollos in this connection; and at first view, the consideration looks like a weighty one. But when we look at the actual treatment of the question by the Christian Fathers, and the exceeding superficiality of their discussion of the subject, the objection loses most of its force. Where the positive testimony is of so little value, the negative testimony of silence cannot be allowed any great weight. As to the other point, *viz.*, that the history of Apollos furnishes no points of support for the personal references at the close of the Epistle, this is perhaps true; but it is equally true, that it furnishes none against them; and these references are so very few and vague, that they are of very slight value in an adjustment of the question. On the whole, while conceding, of course, that "the question of authorship still stands open," I cannot forbear the opinion that the weight of argument is now very strongly in favor of the learned and eloquent Jew of Alexandria.—K.].

§ 3. THE ORIGINAL CIRCLE OF READERS.

Alike the contents and tone of the Epistle show that its recipients are to be regarded as *Jewish Christians*. This is expressed in the superscription (πρὸς Ἑβραίους), which, though we may not, with Credner, regard it as coeval with the Epistle, is yet, at all events, ancient and significant. It is found not merely in the oldest oriental MSS., but, according to Clem. Alex. and Origen, was known even in the West, as early as Tertullian. Taken strictly, the term Ἑβραῖος indicates only *descent* (2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 5), and implies nothing as to *residence* or language. Sometimes, however, it includes a reference also to language (Acts vi. 9; ix. 29), and sometimes the connection would lead us to infer that by the Israelites speaking Hebrew, *i. e.*, Aramaic, are meant those of Palestine. In the *Clementine Homilies*, XI., 35, the Church of Jerusalem is called "The Church of the Hebrews," consisting, as, according to *Eus.* IV., 5, it did, entirely of "Hebrew believers." The term, however, never implies *Jewish customs and religion*, for which Ἰουδαϊσμός is the customary term, 2 Macc. ii. 21; xiv. 38; 4 Macc. iv. 16. According to EUSEB. *Præp. Ev.* VII., 8, the name Hebrews (Ἑβραῖοι) belonged to the Israelites only previously to their receiving the law, and VIII., 12, 14, the *Jews* (Ἰουδαῖοι) are called descendants of the *Hebrews* (Ἑβραῖοι), for which reason at IX. 1, the two names are united as mutually supplementary.

The contents and tone of our Epistle do not allow us to regard it as addressed to Jewish Christians in general (Euthal.; Oecum.); nor to such Christians of Hebrew extraction as, united in one Church with Christians of different origin, were living among Gentiles (Braun, Baumg., Stenglein, Heinrichs, Schwegler, Stier, in part Wieseler). Not a syllable points to relations with Gentile Christians as such. Every thing indicates a purely Jewish community, and that, too, in which many members adhere to the Levitical temple service and sacrificial rites, as to a Divine institution (xiii. 9), and, although they have become believers in Jesus as the Messiah (v. 12), have fallen into a disturbed state of conscience, and danger of apostacy (vi. 6–10; x. 25–32; xii. 15), in that, along with threatened exclusion from participation in the Temple, and from the Commonwealth of Israel, they fear, also, to lose their claim to the salvation and kingdom of the Messiah. Nowhere is there implied in the persons addressed, any *theoretical* preference of the law, against which, as an error fraught with heretical and disturbing tendencies, was frequently directed the sharp argumentation of Paul. *But neither* does the Epistle presuppose any shaking of their faith,—occasioned by the destruction of Jerusalem,—in the fulfilment of the Divine promises given to the Covenant people of the Old Testament, and in the restoration of the nation to a glory corresponding with the character of the New Testament and of its Founder (Kluge). Just as far is it from presupposing an undeveloped Christian life, resting on a feeble faith, which needs to have the groundlessness of its fears set before it in a calm and clear presentation of the real facts of the case (Ebr.). It rather addresses Christians who have formerly had a deeper knowledge than now (v. 11; vi. 4); to whom, however, the capital points in the relation of the New to the Old Covenant have become alarmingly obscured, so that a *warning against apostasy* from Christianity has to be laid upon their consciences with terrible earnestness and severity. In this it is not the feasts and their celebration that are brought into the foreground; but *the Temple with its worship*, especially its *expiatory sacrifices*. The prevailing contrast is not that of synagogue and church, but of *Temple* and the ἐπισυναγωγή of Christians (DEL.); *Conf. van den Ham Diss. expon. doctrinam de Vet. Novoque Test. in epist. ad Hebr. exhibitam, Traj. ad Rhen.*, 1847.

For this reason the Epistle can hardly be addressed to Jewish Churches "in the dispersion," whose members, in their journeys to the feasts, might have been thrown, by their exclusion from the temple, into doubts and anxieties, which led them well nigh to the point of a return to Judaism. Among these Christians "in the dispersion," the slightest possibility, the bare shadow of an allusion, has sufficed to find a home for the readers of the Epistle in Spain, (Nicol. de Lyra); in Rome, (Wetstein, Baur, Holtzmann, Alford); among one or more Italian Churches, yet entirely exclusive of Rome, (Ewald); in Corinth, (Mich. Weber, Mack, Tobler); in Thessalonica (Semler, Nösselt); in Cyprus, (Ullmann; who, however, deems it possible to find them in Alexandria); in Laodicea, (Stein, who finds in it the lost Epistle of Paul mentioned Col. iv. 16); in Asia Minor, (Bengel, Schmid, Cramer); in Antioch, (Böhme); in Lycaonia, (CREDNER, in his *Introd. to the New Test.*, but who subsequently judges differently); in Galatia, (Storr, Mynster); in Ephesus and its adjacent territory, (Baumgarten-Crusius, Röth, the latter standing entirely alone in supposing that the Epistle was addressed to Gentile Christians. If we feel ourselves obliged to leave Palestine wholly out of account (SCHNECKENBURGER and HOLTZMANN in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1859), our thoughts turn most naturally to *Egypt* and the Christians of *Alexandria*. Thus now also CREDNER (*Hist. of the N. Test. Canon*, pp. 161, 182), VOLKMAR (the same, p. 394 f.), HILGENFELD (*Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.*, 1858, I. 103 f.), ED. REUSS (*Gesch. der heil. Schriften des N. Test.* 4 Ausg., 1864), most thoroughly WIESELER (*Untersuchung, etc.*, 2 Hälfte, 1861); still earlier, SCHMIDT (*Einl.* I., p. 284), WIESELER (*Chronologie des apostol. Zeital.*, p. 479 f.), BUNSEN (*Hippolytus* I., p. 365), KÖSTLIN (*Theolog. Jahrb.*, 1854, Heft 3, p. 388). But passages like ch. viii. 3 ff.; ix. 6 ff.; xiii. 13 ff., point clearly to an actual temple of Jehovah with a worship *really present* to the readers,* not to a merely *spiritual* sanctuary, existing only in the author's symbolical interpretation; and the temple of Onias at Leontopolis in Egypt, built under Ptolemy Philometor, and

*[It is difficult to see *what* in the Epistle requires us to suppose a temple in the neighborhood of its readers. The fact that *no single mention* of, or direct allusion to, the temple is made in the Epistle, from the beginning to the end. would seem to indicate the contrary; and it is, in fact, this *utter silence* of the Epistle regarding the temple worship, and the *complete carrying back* of the discussion to the arrangements and rites of the Mosaic tabernacle, which forms the chief *obstacle* to believing that it was addressed to those Jews, whose Judaistic associations all stood connected with the stately ritual

established exclusively (JOSEPH., *Ant.*, 13, 3. 1), for Jews dwelling in Egypt, with reference to Is. xix. 18, 19, and in part obscurely described by JOSEPHUS (*B. Jud.*, 7, 10, 3), was not merely held in light esteem in Palestine, but even Philo knows but one πατρῷον ἱερόν, that of Jerusalem, to which also Alexandrian Jews directed their sacred gifts and their festal journeys (comp. HERZFELD, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel von der Zerstörung des ersten Tempels bis, etc.*, III. p. 557 f. JOST, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, I. 116 f.). We need not, however, for this reason, with EBRARD (*Am. Ed. of Ols. Commen.*, Vol. VI., p. 280), confine the readers to a narrow circle of *Neophytes in Jerusalem*, for whose instruction and confirmation the Epistle was to serve as a sort of manual. Better to adhere still to the view which embraces the Jewish Christians of *Palestine*. To these best apply the few characteristic marks contained in the Epistle. They form evidently the "Second Christian Generation" (Thol.). They have received the gospel not from the Lord Himself, but from His witnesses, subsequently to His ascension, ii. 3. Some of their leaders (ἡγούμενοι) have already suffered martyrdom (v. 12; xiii. 7), and they themselves have already suffered persecutions, although as yet not bloody ones (x. 32; xii. 4), so that there is no discrepancy with Acts viii. 3; xii. i. Further, they have been, in former times, faithful, courageous, and beneficent, as were their fathers (vi. 10; x. 23 f.; xiii. 16); but notwithstanding their earlier attainments (v. 11; vi. 4), and although from the length of time they themselves should have become teachers (v. 12), they have come to need themselves renewed instruction in the very elements of Christianity (vi. 1 f.), and have need to be warned against sensuality and avarice (xiii. 4 f.; xii. 16). The author is obliged, however, at present, to urge mainly the capital point; for in a failure to recognize this, lies the danger of an irrecoverable lapse from Christianity to Judaism. For unless the specific dignity of Jesus is acknowledged, and in His person and history are found the fulfilment of the priestly and sacrificial economy of the Old Testament, then may His blood in the new covenant be again regarded as the impure blood of a malefactor, and His gracious Spirit as a heretical spirit of error and illusion (vi. 6; x. 29). All this is the more to be urged, as in fact, some have already begun to forsake the special Christian assemblies (x. 25), and various previously unknown doctrines have appeared (xiii. 9), on account of which obedience to their leaders (xiii. 17) is sharply enforced.

These passages bear strongly against the theories of the Tübingen School. They furnish the historical proof that Christianity, as it stands vouched for in the canonical writings of the New Testament, was not gradually formed from a conflict of opposing tendencies, partly freer, partly more restricted; but that defections from the primitive Apostolic faith took place at a very early period, and that partly by the relaxing, partly by the obscuring, of an already existing, but divinely instituted life of spiritual faith, doctrinal and moral corruptions found their way into it. These of course stood in connection with other existing forms and tendencies of spiritual life. In this way might arise a division among the Jewish Christians, parallel to that among the Jews themselves; one tendency developing itself into heretical Ebionitism; the other into a Nazaritic sect, whose incipient elements are assailed in this Epistle. HASE (in *Win. and Engel. Journal der theol. Liter.*, II. 3, p. 265 ff.) goes too far in characterizing the Jewish Christians of our Epistle as of the class later known as Ebionites.

§ 4. TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION.

In the passages we have adduced, are found, at the same time, indications of the date of the Epistle. The withdrawal of the Christian Church from the Jewish temple and people, it is well known, took place but gradually. For the Jewish Christians still maintain the observance of the Mosaic law, although not relying on it for justification (Acts ii. 5–15; Gal. ii.); in respect to which observance Wieseler justly distinguishes between those who drew their ideas of the gospel directly from the Law and the Prophets of the Old Testament, and those who held them in their Pharisaic and Rabbinical modifications. Particularly did the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem,

of the temple. It seems difficult to explain how this complete ignoring of the temple could have taken place in connection with readers whose entire religious habits and associations clustered round it. Certainly, we must assume that either the *readers* or the *writer* had been more familiar with the Jewish ritual of the Pentateuch, than with that of Jerusalem and the temple. The *latter* supposition solves the problem, and leaves us at liberty to suppose the Epistle addressed by a Jew of alien birth, and more familiar with Judaism in its historical records, than in its temple worship, to the Christian residents of Jerusalem and Palestine.—K.].

as Israelites who had become believers in Jesus, the Messiah, still along with their separate Christian assemblages, after the example of the Apostles daily visit the temple. But, on the other hand, the Jews still looked upon the first Christians as a party and school within their own sphere of faith and life, in the sense in which the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes are, by Josephus, in philosophic language, named *αἵρεσις* (sects); by the Rabbins כַּת or חֵלֶק, Acts xxiii. 9, *μέρος*. With the growing intensity of feeling, however, of which the Acts of the Apostles gives proof, a period must arrive in which the Jews would not merely (as in May, 58) assail Paul for introducing into the temple a Gentile Christian (Acts xxi. 23 f.), but in which even Jewish Christians themselves would no longer be tolerated in the temple, and that exclusion would take place from the sanctuary of Israel, which, to some, along with doubts regarding this position held by Christianity, might, at the same time, prove a temptation to its abandonment. In this stage of development the Epistle to the Hebrews exhibits the church, and aids essentially our understanding of the character of that period. We may add that KÖSTLIN, who formerly shared the view propounded by Baur and Schwegler; that our Epistle was composed in the course of the second century, has himself, in an extended discussion (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1853, p. 411 ff., 1854, p. 418 ff.) shown the untenableness of the hypothesis.

Approximatively, then, we may fix the date of its composition between the death of James (who was stoned in the year 62 or 63, upon the inauguration of the high-priest Annas, the younger, after the departure of the Procurator Portius Festus, and before the coming of his successor, Albinus, *Jos. Ant. Jud.* XX. 9, 1) and the commencement of the Jewish war in the year 67. For on the one hand, we cannot suppose that the author would have written to the church in such a tone, had a man of the Apostolic dignity and energy of James still stood at its head: and, on the other, we cannot overlook the fact that the calamities of the Jewish war are not mentioned, and that the whole argument produces the impression that the temple at Jerusalem was still standing. Even though we disregard the *present tense* of the verbs in ch. viii. 4; viii. 6–9; xiii. 10, we still cannot otherwise understand ch. ix. 9 than that still, at the present time, sacrifices were offered which could not satisfy the conscience; and ch. viii. 13 speaks not of an economy that has already past away, but only of one on the eve of dissolution. With no sufficient reason SCHMID (*Bibl. Theol.*, II. 61) has revived the theory of the composition of our Epistle after the destruction of Jerusalem, with the design of showing that the law has now been actually merged and done away in Christianity; and KLUGE (*Ep. to the Heb.* p. 204) even maintains that this Epistle is the "Apocalyptik (deriving its theme from Rom. xi. 32) transplanted to the Christian soil, and finding its *outward occasion* in the destruction of the Jewish nation," but in its carrying out blending, it should seem, historical foreshadowings in the spirit of Essenism, with a skilful use of the Sybilline prophecies, of the Book of Enoch and the Apocalypse of Ezra. The mention of Timothy (xiii. 23) determines the time still more exactly, It is, to be sure, uncertain whether the deliverance here *recounted* is identical with that *anticipated* in Phil. ii. 19. It is possible that Timothy was either involved in the trial of Paul, or, in the persecutions under Nero in Italy, was thrown into prison, and subsequently again liberated. For Timothy had been very urgently summoned (2 Tim. iv. 21) to come again to his spiritual father, whose trial had assumed a most serious aspect. But the choice can even then only waver between the end of the year 62, immediately after the death of James, and 64. For we can have no possible ground for assuming, with Bertholdt, an otherwise unknown man, be the name of Timothy. Those who regard the Epistle as written in the name of Paul, perhaps by Luke, must assume that the closing words of this semi-amanuensis are subjoined in his own name, as otherwise we should have contradictory statements standing in close juxtaposition.

The *place* of the composition is unknown. The conjectures regarding it turn on the various interpretations of the expression *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας* (see the exposition at ch. xiii. 24).

[It may be added, I think, that the *most natural* inference from this phrase, is that the writer of the Epistle is *not in Italy*, and that he is writing to persons or Churches that *are*, so that the phrase would indicate both *in* what country the Epistle was *not* written, and *to* what country it *was* written. The obvious import of the language, therefore, favors Alford's view, that it was written outside of Italy (possibly at Ephesus), and sent to Jewish Christians in Rome.

To this view there are certainly some, though, perhaps, not insuperable objections. If we suppose with Moll and the majority, that the Epistle was directed to the Churches of Palestine, then though the *οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας* might, on account of the preposition *ἀπό*, apart from the connection, indicate a composition outside of Italy, yet they might also be used of one who was writing from Italy itself, although, in this case, the preposition *ἐξ* would seem more natural. On the whole this supposition seems more probable, inasmuch as we can hardly see, if the writer was writing from any other country than Italy, to the Christians of Palestine, why he should send the greetings of Italians rather than those of the country from which he wrote. I think then we may infer almost with certainty from these words, that the Epistle was either sent *from*, or sent *to* Italy.—K.].

§ 5. LANGUAGE AND STYLE.

The conjecture which, since Clem. Alex. (Eus. *H. E.*, VI., 14), has occasionally reappeared and been specially defended by Michaelis, that our Epistle is *a translation* from an *Aramaic* original, has not the slightest support in the fact that its original readers lived in Palestine. The proofs collected by Thol. (*Comm.* p. 109 f.) of the wide diffusion of the Greek language in Palestine, as well as of the high estimate placed upon it as the language of intercourse and letters, so that Greek literature was not only studied, but even expressly taught by the Rabbins, are in the highest degree instructive and decisive. The conjecture referred to, however, finds ample refutation in the character of the Epistle itself. The citations from the Old Testament are made so closely from the Septuagint as even to include its errors. On this point, too, Bleek has discovered the important fact that these citations follow the special recension of the *Cod. Alex.*, while Paul, where he quotes from the LXX., follows chiefly the *Cod. Vat.* Only once (ch. x. 30) do we find a citation which accords neither with the Hebrew nor with the Alexandrian Text, but agrees precisely with Rom. xii. 19. Again we find no inconsiderable number of *paronomasiæ* such as belong exclusively to the Greek; and finally, the comparative purity of the language, the flowing character of the diction, the rhetorical beauty and smoothness of the style, the delicate arrangement of the words and the skillful construction of the entire period, forbid our regarding it as a translation. We have, at the same time, in this a marked contrast to *Paul's* habitual mode of expression. In him the Semitic forms of conception prevail, while here the whole form of thought is Greek, and the few so-called Hebraisms which we meet, are explained from a close adherence to the expressions of the Old Testament, and even in part probably already naturalized in the religious phraseology of the Christians. Again we miss entirely the Rabbinical forms of disputation so frequent with Paul; his familiar, *"I would not have you ignorant"* (*οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν*), as well as his customary formulæ of citation, in which the only instance of correspondence is the *τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει* (*"the Spirit saith"*), Gal. iii. 16, and 1 Tim. i. 4. Again, Paul employs the word "Jesus" (Ἰησοῦς) by itself only at Rom. iii. 26; viii. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 3, and is fond of the combination "the Lord Jesus," as also of "the Lord" (*ὁ κύριος*) alone. Here the case is precisely the reverse. So also the unclassical *πάντοτε*, frequent with Paul, occurs here only at vii. 25, while the *εἰς τὸ διηνεκές*, *εἰς τὸ παντελές* of this Epistle occur nowhere else in the New Testament, and *διαπαντός* only at Rom. xi. 10. So *καθίζειν*, here employed intransitively, Paul always makes transitive, except at 2 Thess. ii. 4, and for the *ὑπομονή* of Paul, we here have habitually *μακροθυμία*. In ch. xii. 18 we have the Attic masc. *σκότος*, while elsewhere in the New Testament the word is constantly neuter. So the classical use of *ὅθεν*, *wherefore*, prevails here, which occurs with Luke but once, and never with Paul, who also never employs *παρά* with the Acc. in comparison, a usage familiar to our author. Finally, *κοινωνεῖν* is here correctly united with the *Gen. of the thing*, while the later and, in this construction, unclassical *Dative*, prevails elsewhere in the New Testament.

The absence of the usual Epistolary greeting and salutations with their explanatory designations of the author, does not justify the assumption, specially advanced by Im. Berger (*Moral. Einleit. in's N. T.* III., p. 442 f.) and defended by Valckenaer, Steudel, and de Groot, that the work is not a proper Epistle, but a somewhat modified homily. Nor, carefully distributed as is the subject-matter, and didactic as is its treatment in a form of composition planned with artistic skill, and wrought out with rhetorical elegance, does this still force us to the theory of Ed. Reuss (*Hist. de la theologie Chrétienne*, Paris, 1852, II., 536) that we have before us *the first syste-*

matic treatise on Christian theology; nor to the before-mentioned modification of this view by Ebrard, which makes it a sort of *manual of instruction* specially for a company of recent converts in a definite church. The character of our *Epistle* appears decidedly not merely in the closing words (xiii. 22–25) which some have attempted to separate from the rest, but within the body of the production itself, especially v. 11 f.; vi. 9 f.; x. 32 f.; xii. 4; xiii. 7, 18 f. These passages indicate the *actual concrete needs* of a definite class of readers, and the *practical reasons* for an Epistle to them; and show, at the same time, that the form of exhortation preponderates greatly over that of *consolation*, and that it even takes the character of *warning*. The view of THIERSCH (*Comment. hist. de ep. ad Hebr.*, Marb., 1848), which was refuted specially by DELITZSCH (*Zeitschrift für die luth. Kirche und Theologie*, 1849) that it is *a consolatory Epistle* designed to *strengthen the faith* of Jewish Christians, overborne by the enmity of their countrymen, and excluded from participation in the temple-worship, written about the year 64, and a sort of counterpart to the First Epistle of Peter, which was, in like manner, addressed to persecuted Christians of the dispersion, stands in palpable contradiction to the character of the Epistle itself; and to its tone now of warning, now of threatening, now of earnest summons to a complete shaking off of the ritual of Judaism. Nor is it satisfactory to regard our Epistle as intended to *blend exhortation* with consolation, as THIERSCH has subsequently done ("*The Church in the Age of the Apostles*," 1852, in which he regards the year 63 as the latest assignable date of its composition). The warning character impressed upon the exhortations, exhibits itself not merely in the continuous hortatory strain that follows x. 9, but, like the emotional utterances of Paul, ever and anon breaks the continuity of the previous didactic portions; while it is precisely this *didactic element* which stamps its impress upon the Epistle as a whole. And in this the author displays an admirable power of uniting with the decided rhetorical tendencies of his diction, and with the artistic and skilful rounding of its swelling periods, that complete mastery of his material which enables him, in the unfolding of his subject, to advance with conscious and steady step, and with a clear supremacy of the thought, toward his destined goal.

The conduct of the argument is not, however, mainly *dialectical;* but turns upon the *declarations and institutions of the Old Testament*, which are regarded by the author as *prophecies and types* of the facts and relations of the New. Both the declarations and institutions, however, alike of the Old Covenant and the New, are but *copies* of heavenly originals, and hence cannot dispense with symbolical expression. We may, therefore, with DE WETTE (*Theol. Zeitschr. von* SCHLEIERM., DE W. and LÜCKE, *Berl.*, 1818, III.; comp. SEYFFARTH *de ep. quæ dicitur ad Heb. indole max. peculiari*, Lips, 1821) designate the doctrinal character of our Epistle as the *symbolico-typical*, but must distinguish it entirely from the *allegorical* (see my *diss. Christ. in ep. ad Heb.*, p. I., Halle, 1854). For the Old Covenant economy and the Old Testament declarations have, in the profoundest conviction of our author, the full weight respectively of a Divine institution and of a genuine Divine revelation; and yet they have been purposely so constructed and arranged, and so incorporated into human history, that they appear as but an evanescent and shadowy outline of God's perfect economy, which, by the positive fulfilment of the Old Testament types, the perfect Mediator, Jesus Christ, has established in the world. The author can thus, while unfolding this state of the case to his readers, and giving special proofs and illustrations of it, with entire propriety draw his proofs from the Old Testament itself. The facts and statements of the Old Testament thus preserve their full historical value. Planting himself on the ground of *historical fulfilment*, the author but draws forth to the consciousness of his readers from these facts and declarations, the germs *actually contained* within them, and as it were bursting into fulfilment, of that which they are constituted typically and symbolically to express; and thus inspires the conviction that an abandonment of Christianity, and a retrogression to the Old Testament level, is an unpardoned denial of the true revelation of the living God Himself. This stands in marked and fundamental contrast with that allegorical treatment of the language and economy of the Old Testament, which was specially employed at that time by the Alexandrian Jew Philo. Allegory is there resorted to as a means of effecting an outward connection between *rational* truths and the *letter* of the Holy Scriptures, and of introducing entirely foreign ideas into the Old Testament by means of accidental resemblances, and, by an arbitrary and forced explanation of its institutions, relations, statements and historical accounts, divesting them

of their true historical character and value, and transforming them essentially into the mere vails and husks of ideas, and mere allusions to some fancied truths. Granting, now, certain resemblances between our Epistle and the writings of PHILO (comp. CARPZ., *Sacræ exercitt. in ep. ad Hebr. ex Philone Alex.*, Helms., 1750) not merely in many individual expressions, turns and modes of speech, but also in the mode of employing Scripture, *e g.*, the account of Melchisedek, yet this assuredly involves no dependence of our author upon Philo (KUINOEL in his *Commentary*, and KÖSTLIN in *Theol. Jahrb.* of BAUR und ZELLER, 1854, p. 409) but at most implies only the influence of similar elements of culture (THOLUCK, *Einl.*, p. 84 ff.; RIEHM, *Lehrbegriff*, I., p. 259) which were by no means confined to Alexandria (LIGHTFOOT, *Hor. Heb.*, II., 706; DÄHNE, *Gesch. der jüdisch-Alexandr. Religions-Philosophie*, II. p. 177 and 185; HERZFELD, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, II., p. 271 ff., 501 ff.), and which are commonly rated altogether too highly. The special difficulties, now, which this mode of teaching creates to the interpreter, arise from the fact that the typical and symbolical modes of its conception and explanation, are applied to the setting forth of those heavenly and spiritual relations into which Christ has entered, and into which He introduces His believing followers. For we are in danger of either confounding the *idea* with the *image*, or, in the explanation and resolution of the type, of losing the reality and concrete nature of the idea itself. On the former side lies the false realism of the explanations of Bengel, Oetinger, Menken, Stier; on the latter the false spiritualism of Semler and his followers, who sought in vain to justify, and in part to aid themselves, by their *theory of accommodation;* while more recent rationalistic expositors, particularly Böhme, again adhere strictly to the letter as such, and would hence ascribe to the author thoroughly material conceptions of the heavenly realities.

§ 6. HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION; OR THE THEOLOGICAL AND HOMILETICAL TREATMENT OF THE EPISTLE.

In the Greek Church the *catenæ* of Œcumenius (10th Cent.) and Theophylact (11th Cent.) are specially important as preserving many otherwise lost fragments and individual remarks of Origen, Theod. Mops. and others, and gather up all that had been hitherto furnished. The thirty-four homilies of Chrysostom, published after his death by the Antioch Presbyter, Constantine, from the reports of stenographers (from which source come all the homilies of this eminent father), extend themselves over the entire Epistle, and abound in acute remarks and independent ideas, yet labor under the disadvantages of a corrupt text, of obscurities and even of contradictions. The fragments of explanations, of Cyril. Alex. (published by ANGELO MAI, at Rome, in the *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca T.*, III., and in the *Collectio Nova* T., VIII) are purely doctrinal and directed against the Arian heresy. Theodoret, while exegetically simple and clear, is brief and dry. In the Latin Church, Primasius, Bishop of Adrumet, in the 6th century, while nearly similar in matter, has the advantage of deeper penetration into the doctrinal substance of the Epistle, and of a richer and more pregnant style of expression. From the scholastic age the *enarrationes* ascribed to Anselm of Canterbury, and the *Expositio* of THOMAS AQUINAS are eminently worthy of regard. Whatever else is transmitted from that epoch is scanty and antiquated. Philologically more important is the *Commentary* of J. FABER STAPULENSIS (1512). But the *Adnotationes* of ERASMUS (1516) surpass them in critical acumen, while, at the same time, in their introduction of a method marked by greater exactness of grammatical and historical interpretation, they surpass the *Scholia* of ZEGER (1553), which are also more marked by doctrinal prejudices. His *paraphrases* (1522) also surpass all similar labors in elegance of diction and clearness of style, while, on the other hand, they abound in misconceptions of the fundamental ideas of the Epistle. In the use of the Christian Fathers the Genoese Jesuit, BENED. JUSTINIANI (1612) surpasses, in his *Explanationes*, all commentators, while the celebrated *Commentary* of CORNEL. a LAPIDE (1614) is of very slight importance; and the Benedictine Calmet, held as authority in the Catholic Church (1707), while he accumulates much learned material, yet falls quite below Wilh. Este (1614) in exegetical accuracy, doctrinal clearness, and logical acumen. More recent interpreters in the Roman Catholic Church are Klee, 1833; Lomb, 1843; Stengel, 1849; Bisping, 1854.

Luther and Melancthon have given us no expositions of this Epistle. From Zwingle we have brief *Remarks*, which CASPAR MEGALANDER copied and LEO JUDÄ appended to his edition of ZWINGLE, *Annotationes in plerosque N. T. libros*, 1561. Calvin's exegesis is distinguished by a profounder penetration into the subject-matter; that of Beza is more thorough in the sphere of criticism and philology. Much that is original and valuable has been contributed by the older members of the Reformed Church, Pellicanus, 1539, and Piscator, 1613; somewhat also by Bullinger, Œcolampadius, Aretius, Andr. Hyperius, Grynæus, and Dav. Pareus (1628). Among the older Lutherans the same may be said of Bugenhagen (1525), Joh. Brentz (1571), Major (1571), Vict. Strigel (1565), Lukas Osiander (1585), Ægidius Hunnius (1589), Balduin (1608). Seb. Schmidt of Strassburg (1680), is to be specially distinguished, and Dorscheus (1717) is worthy of attention. Less important are the *Commentaries* of JOH. GERHARD (published after his death without having received his final revision, by JOH. ERNST GERHARD, 1641), and of the Danish Bishop Erasmus Brochman (1706), distinguished as a doctrinal theologian. The philological remarks of J. Camerarius (1556) have lost their value, while the *notæ et animadversiones* of Erasmus Schmidt, appended to the translation of the New Testament (1658), are still quite deserving of regard. A comprehensive gathering up of the results of previous researches is made by ABR. CALOV in the *Biblia Illustrata* (1672–1676), German (1681–1682), in special antagonism to Hugo Grotius. Among the labors of the French and Dutch Theologians of the 17th century, collected in the *Critica Sacra*, and enlarged by further selections in the *Synopsis Criticorum* of MATTH. POLUS, the most valuable for our Epistle are the *Annott.* of JOH. CAMERO and of the brothers CAPPELLUS. The labors of the Arminians, Hugo Grotius, Clericus and Wetstein, are well known in their decided philological, historical and archæological character. Eminently entitled to regard is the *Commentary* of JONAS SCHLICHTING and JOH. CRELL (1634) for its learning, acuteness, subtlety of conception, sound method and—where not interfered with by Socinian prejudices—close adherence to the text, while the exposition of the *Arminian Limborch* (1711) is without special value, as also is the essentially Socinian paraphrase of Arthur Ashley Sykes (1755). More important are the *Remarks* of J. J. SEMLER (1779), appended to his translation. Since Cocceius, who kept tolerably free from the *typological* extravagances of his school, our Epistle has been frequently treated in Holland, and interpreted with special reference to its *typology*, under the form of sermons. Thus Grönwegen, 1693; Caspar Streso, 1661; Clem. Streso, 1714; Hulsius, 1725. The most important, although very discursive, are Akersloot (1697), translated into German 1714, and d'Outrein (1711, German, 1713–1718). In England, John Owen (1668ff.), in 4 folio volumes; *Exercitations on the Epistle of the Hebrews*, specially combats the Socinians. [A convenient edition of OWEN'S *Comm. on the Hebrews*, 6 vols. 8vo. (Ed. with critical notes by W. H. Goold) was published by ROB. CARTER, New York.—K.] In antagonism to the Socinians and Remonstrants, the interpretation of Joh. Braun (Amst., 1705), treats thoroughly the archæology of the Epistle, while JOH. AND. KIESLING (*True Connection of the Mosaic Antiquities with the Exposition of the Epistle of the Holy Apostle Paul to the Hebrews*, Erlangen, 1765) is thoroughly superficial. Of some value is the *Investigatio* of the Leyden PROF. WITTICH, published after his death by DAVID HASSEL, 1692, and the *Comment. Analyt.* of PET. VAN HÖKE, 1693; of still higher merit the *Exposition* of SAM. SZATTMAR NEMETH, published at Franecker, 1695, but originating in Lectures delivered at Clausenburg, in Siebenbürgen.

Another form of interpretation then arose in translations and paraphrases accompanied with remarks, in which class appeared in England, Hammond, 1653; Peirce, 1737; Doddridge, 1738; Pyle (1725), translated by Küster, 1778; Whitby, 1779; in Germany. Michaelis, 1762; Zachariä, 1771; Morus, 1776; Carpzov, 1795. Of little importance are HORNEIUS, *Expositio literalis*, 1655; SCHOMER, *Exegesis*, 1701; OLEARIUS, *Analysis logica cum Observ. Philol.*, 1706. More important are the learned and pithy *Notæ Selectæ* of H. B. STARK, 1710; the *Curæ Philolog. et crit.* of the learned CHR. WOLF, Ed. 2, 1738; the *Remarques hist. et critiq. sur le N. T.*, of the historically learned BEAUSOBRE, 1742; the *Gnomon* of the equally sagacious and profound BENGEL, 1742; the *Exercitatt. ex Philone* of the accurate JOH. BENED. CARPZOV, 1756; the *Observationes* of the grammatically exact CHRIST. SCHMID, 1760; the 4 *Specimina paraphr. et annott.* of the philologically thorough ABRESCH, 1786–1816; and the *Selecta e Scholiis Valckenarii*, published

1817, by WASSENBERGH. Of little importance on the other hand are the *Lectiones Academ.* of ERNESTI, published by Dindorf, 1795, and accompanied by extensive Excursuses. So also the *Scholia* of ROSENMÜLLER (1779, 6 Ed., 1815–1831), and the systematic *Comm.* of BLASCHE, 1782–1786. The transition from the orthodox and dogmatic to the neological school of interpretation, and partly in conflict with this latter, is made by J. J. Rambach, 1742; Cramer, 1757; Struensee, 1763; Sigm. Jac. Baumgarten, 1763; Storr, 1789, 1809. Thoroughly rationalistic are Heinrichs in KOPPE'S *Nov. Test.*, 1792, 2 Ed. 1823 (exceedingly superficial); Dav. Schultz, 1818, who, while completely misconceiving the fundamental idea of the Epistle, yet gives a carefully-wrought translation, and some useful remarks; Böhme, marked by philological painstaking, logical exactness, and a stimulating perspicacity; Kuinoel, 1831, a learned collector of different views; and H. E. G. Paulus, 1833, a translation, with interspersed explanations from the standpoint, and in the spirit of the so-called *Aufklärung*.

Opening, as pioneer, a new path by its thorough, comprehensive, and almost wholly unprejudiced treatment of all the matters falling naturally under discussion, appeared, 1828–1840, the great work of BLEEK, embracing *Introduction*, *Translation* and *Commentary*. On the basis of this arose the *Commentary* of THOLUCK, penetrating deeper into the Theological elements of the Epistle, and rich in independent investigations (1836, 3 Ed., 1850, with two Append., one on the *Applications of the Old Testament in the New*, and another on the idea of *Sacrifice and of priesthood in the Old and New Test.*); the exact, yet all too brief *Exposition* of DE WETTE (1844), 1847; that of Ebrard, 1850 (in continuation of the *Comm.* of OLSHAUSEN *on the N. Test.*); original, stimulating, and often strikingly happy; but frequently failing of the mark, and pronouncing in a tone of dogmatic self-confidence on matters that are not yet ripe for decision; the Critical and Exegetical *Commentary* of LÜNEMANN (1855), forming a part of MEYER'S *Commentary*, distinguished by philological exactness and painstaking; finally the *Commentary* of DELITZSCH, 1857 (with archæological and doctrinal excursuses on sacrifice and atonement), particularly important by its exegetical refutation of many explanations of individual passages in our Epistle in HOFMANN'S *Schriftbeweis* (1852–1855), 2 Ed., 1859 ff., and by the extracts given from BIESENTHAL *Ep. P. ad Hebr. Cum rabbinico Comm.*, 1857.

Extended almost to a Commentary is the "*Lehrbegriff des Hebræerbriefes*," by RIEHM, 1858 and 1859, in which a comparison with the related doctrinal ideas is carried out, and an accurate list of special treatises is appended to the several sections, while KÖSTLIN in his "*Darstellung des Lehrbegriffs des Evangeliums und der Briefe Johannis*" (1843, p. 387–472), develops in an independent manner the doctrinal contents of our Epistle. KLUGE (*Auslegung und Lehrbegriff des Hebræerbriefes*, 1862) merely touches the leading points in brief, and sometimes striking remarks, aphoristical in their nature, but assuming several rather bold positions, of which he fails to give the proof.

In the *practical* treatment of the Epistle we may particularly mention MICH. WALTHER, '*The golden key of the Old, and the sweet kernel of the New Testament,*" *i. e., a thorough, methodical and extended exposition of the immeasurably profound Epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews*, Nuremburg, 1646 (a hundred weekly sermons delivered at Aurich, in Eastfriesland); G. M. LAURENTIUS, *Brief Explanation of the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews*, drawn up in tables, wherein its contents, order and connection are exhibited, its words are explained, and some doctrines naturally derived from them are set forth, 1741; CARL HEINR. VON BOGATZKY, *Devout Considerations and Prayers on the New Testament*, 7 vols., 1758; FRIEDR. CHRIST. STEINHOFER, *Daily nourishment of faith from the knowledge of Jesus, after the weighty testimonies drawn from the Epistle to the Hebrews*, delivered previously in brief discourses, 2 Parts, 1761 (newly edited by LIC. RIEHM, 1859); CARL HEINR. RIEGER, *Reflections on the New Testament*, 4 vols., 3 Ed., 1847; GOTTFR. MENKEN, *Homilies on the 9th and 10th Chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, with appended homilies on some passages of the 12th chapter, 1831; by the same, *Explanation of Ch.* xi. 1821; K. W. STEIN, *The Epistle to the Hebrews theoretically and practically explained, and presented in its general connection*, 1838; RUD. STIER, *The Epistle to the Hebrews interpreted in 36 Meditations*, 2 Parts, 1862; HEINR. LEONH. HEUBNER, *Practical Explanation of the New Testament*, 4 vols., 1859; PHIL. MATTH. HAHN, *Exposition, etc.*, in a brief comprehensive selection from Flattich, jun., newly edited by EHMANN, 1859; J. R. HEDINGER, *Expositions of the*

most difficult passages of the New Testament (with Luther's marginal comments) *and leading practical applications*, newly revised by C. F. Ledderhose, Bd. 2, 1863; FRICKE, *The Epistle to the Hebrews briefly and simply interpreted*, 1864.

Among the more recent expositions in the *English* language we may specially notice the *Commentary* of MOSES STUART, published in 1827, and repeatedly reprinted, [a new abridged and revised Edition, with Notes in one Vol., by R. D. C. Robbins, Andover, 4 Ed., 1860]; the *Recensio Synoptica Annotationis Sacræ* of BLOOMFIELD, 1827; the *Horæ Hebraicæ* of VISCOUNT GEORGE MANDEVILLE, 1835; the *Meditationes Hebraicæ* of WM. TAIT, Bishop of London, 1855; The *Commentary* of HENRY ALFORD, in his edition of the New Testament, Vol. IV., Part 1, 1859.

[We may here further mention in the English language, the Commentary on Hebrews in DR. S. T. BLOOMFIELD'S *Greek Testament with English Notes*, 9 Ed., London, 1855, 2 vols., candid, cautious and sensible, not profound, and following pretty closely in the steps of Prof. Stuart. The Commentary on Hebrews in CHR. WORDSWORTH'S *Edition of the Greek Testament*, with Introductions and Notes, New Edition, London, 1864; reverent, considerably learned, conservative, and valuable for its numerous citations from the Fathers; much more valuable as a Commentary than the work of Dr. BLOOMFIELD. Wordsworth advocates the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. (See LANGE on *Matth.*, SCHAFF'S *Introd.*, p. 18). CONYBEARE and HOWSON'S *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 2 vols., contains, at the close of the second volume, a translation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, with brief annotations. They ascribe the Epistle to Barnabas. Among other English works may be mentioned MACKNIGHT on the *Epistles*, with revised version and notes, and the Commentaries in Gill, Scott, Henry, Adam Clarke, Burkitt, *etc*.

Of works on Hebrews published in *America*, we may mention, besides the elaborate work of Prof. Stuart, *The Epistle to the Hebrews in Greek and English*, with an analysis and Exegetical Commentary, by SAMUEL H. TURNER, D.D., 1855. Dr. Turner favors the view that Paul was the author of the substance of the Epistle, but not strictly of the language.—"*A Critical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, by FRANCIS S. SAMPSON, Prof. of Oriental Literature, *etc.*, in the Union Theol. Sem., Va., 1856; a posthumous publication, but nearly finished by the author. Both these two latter works are candid and sensible, but scarcely grapple with the difficult points of the Epistle. Dr. Sampson regards Paul as the author of the Epistle.—Dr. Albert Barnes' volume of notes on the Hebrews, forming a part of his notes for Sabbath Schools, does not, of course, profess to be critical. *Lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, by WM. LINDSAY, D.D., Prof. of Exeg. Theol. in the United Pres. Church, 2 vols., 1867.—K.].

In the *French* language C. CH. MEYER, *Essai sur la doctrine de l'épitre aux Hébr.*, 1845; and the *Essai* of a Translation, accompanied with a Commentary by ED. REUSS, which appeared first in the *Nouvelle Revue de Théologie*, Vol. V., 1860, and was afterwards separately published in 1862. An independent value belongs to the remarks in the "*Berlenburger Bibel*," 1739, and to those in O. v. GERLACH'S *New Testament*, 3 vols. We can use, however, only with caution, the "*New system of all the types of Jesus Christ, through the entire Old Testament*, by PHIL. FRIEDR. HILLER, 1758;" a work not free from arbitrary and capricious interpretations (New Ed. by Alb. Knapp, 1858), as well as HILLER'S "*Types of the New Test. in the Old Test.*, 1776,"—a New Ed. by Alb. Knapp, 1859.

§ 7. THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEA, AND THE ORGANIC CONSTRUCTION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

The entire Epistle turns upon the idea that true constancy in the Christian faith is absolutely indispensable to an entrance into that rest of God which He has promised to His people. For Jesus Christ has not only gone personally into this rest, but He is the only actual Mediator of this entrance for all who believe in Him; because He, as Son, is the perfect Mediator, infinitely exalted above all the Mediators of the Divine revelation, and in Him the divinely instituted types and symbols of the Old Testament economy have their actual and complete fulfilment. The economy of salvation unfolded in the Old Testament, then, having its historical central point in that priestly and sacrificial ritual which was inseparable from the foundation of the Mosaic law, stands in no relation of antagonism to the institution of the New Covenant, whose historical, and, at the same time, whose everlasting central point is Jesus, the Messiah. Rather must we

say that the revelation of God in the Old Testament itself, predicts this merging of the Old Covenant in the New by such a fulfilment of it. For this reason a repudiation of the New Covenant is an irrecoverable falling away from salvation, and an inexcusable opposition to the manifest will of God Himself.

The ordinary division into a doctrinal and a hortatory part obscures the character of the Epistle as determined throughout by the *actual necessities* of its readers, and is incompatible with its constantly reappearing tone of admonition and warning; while it gives, at the same time, to the first part, a false independence of the rest. The doctrinal teachings not merely pave the way for and introduce the exhortations; they *generate* them, as a living product and proof of the moral and religious character of the truth which is unfolded to their view, as will appear in the following tabular resumé.*

FIRST PART.

THE ELEVATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT MEDIATOR, AS SON, ABOVE ALL OTHER MEDIATORS OF REVELATION AND REDEMPTION.

1*st Section.*—Elevation of Jesus Christ above the *prophets*, and above the *angels*, the mediators of the Old Covenant.

1. The final revelation of God has been made in the Son, the perfected Mediator, elevated above all, and exalted over all, whose preëminence above the angels is indicated even in their respective names. Ch. i. 1–4.
2. Proof from Scripture of the elevation of Jesus Christ as Son of God and King above the angels. Vv. 5–14.
3. A warning exhortation to give heed to a revelation mediated in so extraordinary a manner. Ch. ii. 1–4.
4. The elevation of Jesus above the angels is not disparaged by His earthly life, which, rather, opens the way for the exaltation of humanity. Vv. 5–13.
5. The incarnation renders the Son of God susceptible of suffering and death, and thus fits Him to be a high-priest with God, for the redemption of mankind. Vv. 14–18.

2*d Section.*—*Preëminence of Jesus Christ above the divinely-commissioned servants and leaders of Israel, Moses and Joshua.*

1. The exhortation to fidelity toward God's faithful messenger, Christ, rests on Christ's superiority as the Son ruling over the house, to Moses the faithful servant in the house. Ch. iii. 1–6.
2. The Old Test. threat that unbelievers shall not enter into the rest of God, is to be all the more earnestly laid to heart by the people of God of the New Covenant. Vv. 7–19.
3. The promise of an entrance into the rest of God, has not merely perpetual validity, but comes to us Christians with special force. Ch. iv. 1–10.
4. Let us, therefore, by so much the more, refrain from disobeying God, as His word is of extraordinary power and efficacy. Vv. 11–13.

3*d Section.*—Elevation of Jesus Christ above Aaron and his high-priestly successors.

1. The elevation of Jesus Christ as a high-priest who has past through the heavens, furnishes a ground for the exhortation to hold fast our Christian profession. Vv. 14–16.

[* That Moll's view regarding the division of the Epistle is in part substantially correct, I readily admit. It is very easy to draw in the Epistle a stronger and broader line of distinction than ever lay in the mind of the writer. The Epistle is organically one, and practical considerations determine its entire character and contents. Yet, after all, there *is* an actual and clearly marked *line of distinction*, which I think it is important to recognize. Up to ch. x. 18 the Epistle is *prevailingly didactic*, and the hortatory parts are but incidental and subordinate; from x. 19 to the end, it is almost exclusively hortatory. This distinction, of course, has not reference to the *purpose* of the writer,—that is throughout equally practical—but only to the *manner* in which he *accomplishes* his purpose. To that accomplishment both the didactic and the hortatory portions are equally tributary. But as the Epistle opens *didactically*, and continues prevailingly so (with, indeed, considerable interruptions) until ch. x. 18, and then becomes exclusively hortatory, I think no confusion arises in recognizing the fact. On the other hand, I think Moll has vitiated and darkened *his* analysis by uniting under his "Third general division" the latter part of the didactic portion from ix. to x. 18, with the entire remaining hortatory part. He has, I think, arbitrarily and violently separated a discussion which from ch. viii. 1, to x. 18, preserves a close and unbroken unity.—K.].

2. Christ is qualified to be a high-priest, primarily, by His ability to sympathize with human weakness. Ch. v. 1–3.
3. He is so qualified by His call to this office from God, and that as antitype of Melchisedek. Vv. 4–10.

SECOND PART.

ELEVATION OF CHRIST AS ETERNAL PRIESTLY KING, THE COUNTERPART OF MELCHISEDEK.

1st *Section.—Transition* to this discussion by a passage of censure, warning, consolation and exhortation.

1. The readers are still deficient in a right understanding of this typical relation. Vv. 11–14.
2. Hence an urgent summons to them to strive after Christian maturity and perfection. Ch. vi. 1–3.
3. For it is impossible that they who have once experienced the gracious influences of Christianity, and fallen away from them, should be again restored to their former gracious state. Vv. 4–8.
4. The readers, however, are still in that condition which renders possible, by the grace of God, their attainment of the goal, after which they are earnestly to strive. Vv. 9–12.
5. The example of Abraham shows that endurance in faith leads to the attainment of the promise—a promise ratified by the oath of God. Vv. 13–15.
6. Encouragement to Christians to hold fast to the promise thus assured to them. Vv. 16–20.

2d *Section.—The eternal and perfect high-priesthood of Jesus Christ.*

1. The person of Melchisedek has, as type, a threefold superiority to the Levitical priests. Ch. vii. 1–10.
2. The O. T. predicts the abrogation of the Levitical priesthood, resting, as it does, on the Mosaic law, by the priesthood of the Messiah, as that which is eternal. Vv. 11–19.
3. Preëminence of the New Covenant in that Jesus personally stands as its guaranty and pledge. Vv. 20–22.
4. Christ lives forever, and can hence, in His unchangeable priesthood, forever intercede with God on behalf of the redeemed. Vv. 23–25.
5. As the Sinless Son of God, Jesus Christ has once for all offered Himself as a sacrifice for the sins of the world. Vv. 26–28.

3d *Section.*—This priesthood Christ fulfils as heavenly king and mediator of the New Covenant, predicted in the Old Testament.

1. As high-priest of the true sanctuary which God reared and not a man, Christ has taken His seat at the right hand of Majesty in the heavens. Ch. viii. 1–5.
2. Christ's priestly service is by so much the more excellent, as the covenant of which He is Mediator rests on better promises than that old covenant, which, according to the testimony of the Old Testament itself, is destined to destruction. Vv. 6–13.

THIRD PART.

PRE-EMINENCE OF THE NEW COVENANT MEDIATED THROUGH JESUS CHRIST.

1st *Section.*—The New Covenant *accomplishes that approach and nearness to God* which the old but symbolically represents and promises.

1. The typico-symbolical character of the Mosaic sanctuary, points, in itself, to an imperfect fellowship with God. Ch. ix. 1–10.
2. Perfect communion with God is rendered possible by the perfect Mediatorship of Jesus Christ, on the ground of a true expiation. Vv. 11–15.
3. For concluding this New Covenant the blood of Jesus Christ was indispensable. Vv. 16–22.

4. The necessary, yet unrepeated sacrificial death of Christ has wrought an all-sufficient expiation. Vv. 23–28.
5. The perpetually repeated expiatory offerings of the Old Covenant attest their impotence for a real taking away of sin. Ch. x. 1–4.
6. Scripture proof of the complete validity and finality of the sanctification obtained on the foundation of the obedience of Jesus Christ. Vv. 5–18.

2d Section.—Exhortations, warnings, and *promises* suggested by the preceding.

1. Decided and unwavering adherence to the Christian faith, livingly attesting itself in Christian communion, is pressingly enforced by reference to the *Parousia.* Vv. 19-25.
2. The severest and inevitable judgment of God is visited upon apostasy from once known and acknowledged Christian truth. Vv. 26–31.
3. A speedy entrance into bliss awaits those who are steadfast to the end, for which the readers have ground of hope in their former fidelity. Vv. 32–39.

3d Section.—A survey by way of encouragement, of the history of their believing forefathers.

1. Edifying patterns of faith down to Abraham. Ch. xi. 1–7.
2. The example of Abraham and Sarah. Vv. 8–12.
3. Glance at the patriarchs, with a special prominence given to the faith manifested by Abraham in offering up his son. Vv. 13–19.
4. Examples of Isaac, Jacob and Joseph. Vv. 20–22.
5. Example of Moses. Vv. 23–29.
6. Examples from the conquest of Canaan to the time of the Maccabees. Vv. 30–40.

4th Section.—An appeal summing up the results of the preceding historical survey.

1. In possession of such patterns and examples, and looking to Jesus Himself, the readers should maintain with steadfastness the struggle that lies before them. Ch. xii. 1–3.
2. Their sufferings are salutary chastisements of God's paternal love. Vv. 4–13.
3. They are to resist incipient apostasy, by striving after union and sanctification. Vv. 14–17.
4. To this they are held under obligation by the character of the New Covenant. Vv. 18-24.
5. The guilt and punishment of apostasy stands in proportion to the blessings and obligations of the New Covenant. Vv. 25–29.

CONCLUSION OF THE EPISTLE.

1. Practical exhortations of a more general character. Ch. xiii. 1–6.
2. *Special* exhortations in reference to their tendencies to apostasy. Vv. 7–17.
3. Personal communications. Vv. 18–25.

THE EPISTLE

TO THE

HEBREWS.

PART FIRST.

The elevation of the New Testament Mediator as Son above all other mediators of Revelation and Redemption.

FIRST SECTION.

ELEVATION OF JESUS CHRIST ABOVE THE PROPHETS AND ABOVE THE ANGELS, THE MEDIATORS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

I.

The final Revelation of God has been made in the Son, the perfect Mediator, elevated above all, and exalted over all, whose preëminence above the Angels is indicated even in their respective names.

Chapter I. 1–4.

God who at sundry times [in many parts] and in divers manners [many ways] spake
2 in time past [of old, *πάλαι*] unto the fathers by [in, *ἐν*] the prophets, hath in these last
days[1] spoken [spake in the closing period of these days] unto us by [in] his Son, whom
3 he[4] hath [*om.* hath] appointed heir of all things, by whom also he [he also][2] made the
worlds; who, being the brightness of his glory, and the express image [impression]
of his person [substance], and upholding all things by the word of his power, when
he had by himself[3] purged our [after making a cleansing of] sins, sat down on the
4 right hand of the Majesty on high; being made [becoming] so much better than
[*χρείττων*, mightier than, superior to] the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained
[hath inherited] a more excellent name than they.

[1] Ver. 1.—*ἐπ' ἐσχάτου* instead of *ἐσχάτων* after Cod. Sin. A. B. D. E. K. L. M.

[2] [Ver. 1.—*πολυμερῶς in many parts*, or *portions* (*μείρομαι, divide, μέρος, a part*), not, *at sundry times*, (which may follow as a fact) but as it were *fragmentarily, by piece-meal.* *Πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως* emphatically and sonorously open the majestic sentence.—*λαλήσας after speaking*, or *having spoken*. Though the Eng. Perfect is not strictly the proper rendering of the Aor. participle, it is not unfrequently, though by no means uniformly, and, I think, not commonly, the best English equivalent for it,—*ἐν, in*, with Owen, Alf., de Wette, Moll, &c., is taken in its proper signification of *in*. Unless perhaps sometimes by a Hebraistic use, it should so be always taken, although the Eng. idiom sometimes requires a different rendering. But not so here. Owen: "The *certainty* of the revelation and the *presence* of God with His word are intimated in the expression,"—*ἐπ' ἐσχάτου* better taken as neuter—*in the closing period of these days*,—*ἐλάλησεν, spake*, (not, *hath spoken*)

viz., historically when Christ appeared as Messiah,—*ἐν υἱῷ*, *in one who was Son:* the absence of the article turning the attention from the *individual* to the *character*.

[2] Ver. 2.—The position of ἐποίησεν immediately after καί, was recommended by Griesb., after A. B. D*. D***. E. M., is approved by Lachmann and Tischendorf, and confirmed by Cod. Sin. [This reading emphasizes the ἐποίησεν.]

Ver. 2.—ὃν ἔθηκε, *whom he appointed*, Aor. pointing, as ἐλάλησεν above, *to the historical act*.—καὶ ἐποίησεν, *he also made*, implying the naturalness of making Him *heir* of the universe who had been the agent of His power in *making* it.

[3] Ver. 3.—δι' ἑαυτοῦ before καθαρισμόν is cancelled by Bleek, de Wette. Lachm., Tischendorf, Alford, but readmitted by Tisch. VII., and Reiche (Comm. Crit. 6) after D***. and nearly all the minusc.; but is wanting in Sin., as in A. B. D**. The Uffenbach Uncial fragment (Tisch. *Anecdota Sacra et Profana*, p. 177) reads τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως, δι' ἑαυτοῦ καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος.

Ver. 3.—ἀπαύγασμα, *radiant image*—ὑπόστασις, not *person*, but *substantia*, *substance*.—φέρων, *bearing*, τῷ ῥήματι, *by the utterance*, *mandate*—Ποιησάμενος, *after making for himself*, Aor. Med. implying the completion of the act in His own person.

[4] Ver. 3.—Sin. omitting ἡμῶν has τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησ., the order which after A. B. D. E. M. has been prevalent since Bengel. A later hand has *added* ἡμῶν in the Sin.

Ver. 4.—κρείττων. *mightier than*, *superior to*.—γενόμενος, *becoming*, not *being made*, by which γίγνομαι, ἐγενόμην should rarely be rendered when applied to persons, though they may be when applied to things.—κεκληρονόμηκεν, *hath inherited*.—K.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **In many parts, and in many ways.**—Although the rich and full-sounding words [πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως] which open the Epistle, form an evidently intended and favorite assonance, they are by no means to be regarded (as by Chrys. and Thol.) as a mere rhetorical expansion of one and the same thought. We must rather recognize in them the characteristic peculiarities of the Old Testament revelations. For πολυμερῶς (*in many parts*) points not merely to the external, manifold diversity of the revelation at different times and in different persons (Bl.), or to its quantitative succession (Del.), but to the fact that by none of the many prophets, whether appearing in succession or contemporaneously, was the counsel of God revealed perfectly and in undivided fulness, but only fragmentarily and in a manifold diversity of parts. The entire prophetic function of humanity bears the characteristic "*in part*" (ἐκ μέρους, 1 Cor. xiii. 9). From this is to be distinguished a multiplicity of *modes* (τρόποι), the diversity in the forms and methods of the revelation made to the fathers. In view of this connection, we are not to refer the term to the different forms of divine communication made to the prophets themselves, as "by dreams, visions from mouth to mouth" (Num. xii. 6 ff.); but partly to the distinction of law and prophecy, doctrine and exhortation, warning and consolation, threatening and promise in the prophetic discourses; partly to the diversity—conditioned by personal individuality—in the modes of teaching of an Isaiah and an Ezekiel, a Moses and a David. Both adverbs awaken at once in the reader the thought that a Revelation of such character cannot be final and perfect, but needs supplementing and completion. Kluge finds also in the words, the painstaking solicitude of the Divine instructions.

In time past.—Πάλαι points to the fact that the Old Testament revelation has long since past, having come with Malachi to its canonical conclusion; so that nothing was henceforth to be expected but the coming of him who was predicted by that prophet, the "messenger of the covenant" who immediately preceded the coming of the Lord Himself. The 'Fathers' to whom the prophetic words were addressed, are the forefathers of the Jews. Sir. xliv.; Acts iii. 22; Rom. ix. 5.

In the Prophets.—The contrasted ἐν υἱῷ forbids our referring this to the prophetic *writings* (Fr. Schmidt, Stein). Further, we are neither to supply ὤν, *being*, nor to take ἐν *instrumentally* (Chrys., Luth., Calv., Grot.; Thol., Ebr., Del.). This construction is commonly taken as an Hebraism: so Del. compares 1 Sam. xxviii. 6, 2 Sam. xxiii. 2: דִּבֶּר בְּ. Others, as Thol, point to a similar use of ἐν in the classics (Bernhardy's *Synt.* 210). But ἐν, according to Kühner, § 600, 3, admits instrumentality only in connection with *things*,* and neither our author's style nor the sense form here a deviation from the customary import of ἐν. For He who *speaks* is God. The *prophets* are the *organs* of His revelation, completely controlled by Him, and *in whom* His own utterances are heard. This presupposes a transient indeed and indirect, but still real union of God with the prophets. But this union is not an essential, and as it were, *metaphysical* entrance into human nature, nor a settled, peaceful indwelling of God in the prophets wrought through the Spirit; but a divine *activity* in the prophets, coinciding and blending itself with the prophetic utterance. Precisely for this reason the prophets could never become to the fathers a proper manifestation of God, could never become a *Theophany*. They were, as shown by the λαλήσας (*spoke*), the *tongues* of God, and even the *form* of the prophetic utterances is the result of God's purpose and agency, and must not be regarded as something barely human and separable from its divine subject-matter. Precisely for this reason could Paul argue (Gal. iii. 16,) from the form as such. Finally, the word prophet is here used in the broader sense, which extends the name to Abraham (Gen. xx. 7), and the patriarchs generally (Ps. cv. 15); as also to Moses (Deut. xxxiv. 10).

At the end of these days.—The expression ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων, *at the end of these days* is rightly to be understood only as a *terminus technicus* in connection with the Hebrew בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים (*at the end of the days*). These words, which originally pointed only to the future, became, on account of their frequent connection with Messianic prophecies, a standing designa-

* [True indeed, Jelf, (*Gr. Gram.* 3 Ed. 1861) gives Vol. II. § 622, examples of ἐν "applied to *persons* viewed as instrumental agents." Herod. ix. 48 ψευσθῆναι ἐν ὑμῖν, *to be deceived by* (lit. in) *you:* Thucyd. vii. 8: So Gr. Test. Matth. ix. 34, ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμόνων, *to cast out, etc. by the ruler of the devils:* Acts xvii. 31, ἐν ἀνδρὶ κρίνειν, *to judge by the man, etc.* Still it may be doubted if in these cases the departure from the proper force of ἐν is not more apparent than real, and here to suppose such departure is by no means necessary; and I incline with Moll to regard the author's conception, not as that of God's speaking by the prophets and His Son, but *in* them.—K.]

tion for the Messianic time, which brings to an end the עוֹלָם הַזֶּה *αἰὼν οὗτος* and introduces the coming age עוֹלָם הַבָּא *αἰὼν μέλλων* as the period, commencing with the resurrection, of the glorious manifestation of the kingdom of God. In the Jewish conception this period coincided with the appearance of the Messiah.

Since this was looked for in the "time of the end," Dan. viii. 17–19, or "at the end of time," Dan. xii. 13, to the Christian conception this divides itself into two sections of which the first commences with the appearance of Jesus Christ in the flesh, the second with the reappearance of Him who has been exalted at the right hand of God. The two divisions stood in the contemplation and hope of the early church, in close proximity, and were essentially identical: for the latter contains only the complete manifestation of what was essentially and substantively commenced in the former: Col. iii. 3–4. The expression 'last days' (*ἔσχαται ἡμέραι*) James v. 3, comprehends therefore the whole time from the birth of Jesus Christ to His second coming, which takes place in the *καιρὸς ἔσχατος* 1 Pet. i. 5 after the accomplishment, 'in the last times,' *ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς* (1 Tim. iv. 1), of the signs preceding His second coming. Then all promises receive their final fulfilment, Heb. xi. 40, xii. 28; and for believers their entrance into *rest* (*κατάπαυσις* ch. iv. 4, 11), and into the *Sabbatism* (*σαββατισμός* iv. 10) is accomplished at the same time with their emancipation into the glorious freedom of the children of God, Rom. viii. 21. Thus the first coming of Jesus Christ falls "at the end of the times" (*ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων*), 1 Pet. i. 20, when the "fulness of time" (*πλήρωμα τῶν χρόνων*) had come, Gal. iv. 4. Precisely for this reason does Peter recognize in the miracle of the Pentecost (Acts ii. 17), the fulfilment of a prophecy in regard to that which was to happen "in the last days" (*ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις*); as elsewhere the appearance of certain heretical teachers recalls prophecies in regard to the 'end of time' (Jude 18), or 'of the days' (2 Pet. iii. 3). The *οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα* (coming world) which is subjected not to angels, but to the Lord, (Heb. ii. 5) or the new order of things, (*the season of rectification, καιρὸς διορθώσεως*), ix. 10, commences, therefore, with the founding of the Christian church; and believers have since their conversion tasted along with the word of God, the "powers of the *world to come*," vi. 5. For Christ appeared for the doing away of sins by the sacrifice of Himself, "at the consummation of the ages" (*ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ αἰώνων*, ix. 26.) There is, thus, now nothing to be looked for but the second coming, 1 Thess. iv. 15. Already has the "last time" (*ἐσχάτη ὥρα*) begun, 1 John ii. 18. The expression has not a chronological, but a doctrinal and moral import. When, therefore, it is said that God has spoken in the Son, *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου ἡμερῶν τούτων*, the expression cannot, viewed with reference either to the language or to the fact, mean "at last in these days" (Vulg., Luth., Dav. Schulz). The *ἡμέραι αὗται*, *these days*, are not the days in which the readers and the author live, but they correspond to the *αἰὼν οὗτος this age* or *time*, and *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου* is to be taken as neuter, indicating the close of the ante-Messianic time. The demonstrative points not to a *chronological*, but to a *doctrinal* conception. So also *ἡμῖν* denotes, in contrast with the 'fathers,' the author with his readers as belonging to the Christian period.

In the Son.—The absence of the article before *υἱῷ* has its ground not in the fact that *υἱός* can be used of Christ after the manner of *a proper name*, and thus be determined in itself (Böhme, Bloomf., Del., Riehm), which none can doubt, but in the fact that it is here not the *individual*, whom the author would signalize, but the *character*, or *relation*. In distinction from the well-known prophets, the organ of God's utterances at the close of the ages is one who stands to God in the relation of *Son*. Thus we have no longer to do with a continuance of God's *prophetic* oracles; but with a form of divine revelation specifically different from all that preceded it, yet maintaining its organic connection with them by the fact of its proceeding from the same God who spoke to the Fathers.

VER. 2. **Appointed.**—It were possible (with Bengel, Bleek, Lünemann) to understand this of an appointment in the divine purpose and counsel. But the connection of the clauses is not such as to indicate an enumeration of the several stages from the *ante-temporal* act of destining the pre-existing Son to be the inheritor of all things, to the actual fulfilment of this purpose in the redemption wrought by the Incarnated Word. The question evidently is rather of the *historical Mediator* of the Divine Revelation, who stands in the relation of Son. The import of this term it is now the special purpose of the writer to unfold, and this the more, in that, on the one hand, the term 'Son of God' has in the Old Testament itself a different signification; and, on the other, that he has hitherto spoken of that *prophetic* revelation of God which expresses itself in the *word*. For this reason he adds two clauses by way of specially defining the term Son, each of which expresses in its own peculiar manner *this* Son's uniqueness of nature and infinite elevation. He is the Ruler who being *worshipped as Lord* (*κύριος*), has been by right of inheritance, and thus legitimately and by virtue of His divine Sonship, exalted to this dignity. And this exaltation is no *apotheosis:* no elevation of *a man* (as Socinianism would have it) to a divine position and dignity; it corresponds to the relation which this personage sustained to God before the ages. The Mediator of God's final revelation in His word, is also the Mediator of the exercise of His power in creation. Thus through the relative (*ὅς, who*) the discourse passes over from *God*, the subject of the preceding clauses, to this *mediator* as subject of the following. In these the term *ἐκάθισεν* points to the *joint agency* of Christ in the act of His exaltation: while the participial clauses preceding bring out the indispensable and vital points of the Son's having taken His place at the right hand of God only after accomplishing the work of redemption, and under what essential attributes of His person and agency (what *being* and what *doing*) all this has been accomplished. The participial clause *ποιησάμενος* (*after making, etc.*) gives the *work* which in perfect freedom the Son has accomplished before His exaltation; the

participial clause γενόμενος (*becoming so much greater, etc.*) describes the position and recognition awarded to Him in consequence of that work; while the two participial clauses ὤν and φέρων (*being, etc.*, and '*bearing*' or '*upholding*,' *etc.*) indicated by the closely connecting particle τε as standing in intimate relationship, and designedly placed before the others, express the unoriginated and unchangeable, and thus eternal and identical being and agency of the Mediator of Redemption and Creation. We must not deny (with Lün.) that also these latter clauses have to do with the *manifested Messiah*. But from this it follows neither that, as descriptive of the personal qualities of Christ, they assign the internal ground of His exaltation (de Wette), nor that they characterize the Son in the inmost and essential ground of His absolute personality (Del.), nor that referring to Him presumably *merely* as the *exalted* one, they point to merely economical relations in the accomplishment of redemption (V. Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, 2d ed. 1. p. 140 ff.). They point us rather to the unchangeable essence, the ever uniform and invariable activity of the Mediator of the New Covenant. They contain "a characteristic of the Son, as designating that nature which belongs peculiarly to Christ in each and all of His various modes of existence." (Riehm, I. 278). For the Pres. Part. marks not in itself any independent *time* but simply co-ordinates the action with that of the principal verb. But if, as here, the principal verb is past, the contemporaneous action in the subordinate clause is expressed not by the Pres. but by the Imperf. The *Present* characterizes by pointing to permanent features and essential attributes.

The worlds.—As no trace of controversy with Gnostic notions of Æons and Angels, held by Jews, is found elsewhere in our epistle, we must, were it even for this reason, decline to refer the αἰῶνες here to angels (as earlier expositors with Wolf). The passage ch. xi. 3 proves also that αἰῶνες cannot signify *secular periods* (Chrys.), still less the two cardinal epochs of the world's history, the Mosaic and the Christian (Bolten, Paulus, Stolz, Stein), but only *the world* as existing and moving in time. Its parallel is found in the Old Testament הָעוֹלָמִים which (from עָלַם, *to veil, hide*,) signifies originally only successive periods of time lying beyond the vision, but in the writings of the Rabbins, the *worlds* as the hidden, unfathomable, concrete product and expression of the hidden, unfathomable ages of time. The transition in signification is found Eccles. iii. 11. As, however, αἰών never signifies time or eternity *in the abstract*, but both only under the category of progress and movement in which spiritual forces are active, so with the relation of this word to the idea of the *world*. It denotes the world not as the mere aggregate of all things, the universe, (τὰ πάντα), not as the manifold variety of things wrought into an organic unity and harmony (κόσμος); nor again the world in its materiality, perishableness, and vanity; but as a system of spiritual relations and powers in whose *phenomena* we may discern the νοούμενα, Rom. i. 20. These invisible, spiritual and permanent potencies of the phenomenal world are no individual Angels and Æons, no powers independently fashioning the world, and no world of *Ideas* after whose model God was constrained to fashion and to build the world of phenomena. Rather God has formed these through His Son, and according to ch. xi. 3, arranged and reduced them to order by His creative word. It is these αἰῶνες which, amidst all phenomenal vicissitudes and fluctuations, and the ceaseless passing away of individual existences, remain permanent in the world. But Jehovah is ὁ θεὸς τῶν αἰώνων, Sirach xxxvi. 19; ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων (Tob. xiii. 6, 10; 1 Tim. i. 17). The emphasis in our passage lies not on the fact that God through the Son has made also (=*even*) the *Æons*, but that in connexion with the fact that He *constituted* or *appointed* the Son heir of the worlds, we are also to look at the fact that through Him He *made* (ἐποίησεν) the world.

Ver. 3. **Beaming image.**—'Απαύγασμα is by Bleek following previous interpreters (as Clarius, Schlichting, Capellus, Gerhard, Calov., Böhme), explained as *effulgence, beaming* or *shining forth;* but the form of the word would lead us to take it passively. We might hence (with Erasm., Calv., Bez., Grot., *etc.*) refer it to the *image*, the form *received* and *reflected* in a mirror. More exactly, however, it denotes the distinct, concrete *result* of the *beaming* or *shining forth* (Lob., *Paralip.* 396, Krüger, *Gr. Gram.* 191); so that according to Lün. it involves a threefold idea: 1. that of *independent existence;* 2. that of *origin* or *descent;* 3. that of *likeness*. Δόξα denotes the resplendent glory of God's majesty as the means by which He makes a revelation of Himself, and claims the adoring recognition of His creatures. In Christ this glory is received and concentrated in an individual, personal image, *rayed* or *beamed forth*, as it were, from the Deity, and itself, therefore, beaming forth its brightness in turn. This *beaming image* is thus no mere mirrored reflection, no fleeting phenomenon produced merely for a specific and definite purpose. It has expressed in it the essential being of God, just as the figure or image is contained in the die. The numerous significations of ὑπόστασις may be reduced to four fundamental ones: 1. *underplacing, underlaying*, hence, *foundation, basis, substruction, support*, even *sediment;* 2. the fact of *putting one's self under a thing, taking it upon one's self;* hence, *firmness, steadfastness, confidence of spirit, enterprise, determination;* 3. that which lies at the basis as the *proper object*, or *subject matter* of a discourse or narrative; 4. *real being* in contrast with fancy and illusion; hence, *essence, substance*. Since now every real being has a special mode of existence corresponding to its essence, the term ὑπόστασις could become a doctrinal *terminus ecclesiasticus* for the trinitarian distinction in the existence of God=πρόσωπον, *persona*, and so many interpreters explain it here, even Calvin, Beza, Gerhard, Calov., Thom. Aquinas, Bellarmine, and Corn. a Lapide. This signification of the word, however, belongs demonstrably to a later ecclesiastical usage. We must refer the term, therefore, to the essential being of God, as Philo employs it as a synonym of οὐσία, and the Vulgate translates *figura substantiæ ejus*, or still better Origen de Princip. iv. 2, 8, *figura expressa substantiæ*. For the etymology of χαρακτήρ points at all events to a *means* by which a thing is made recognizable

or even valid in exchange, and that by stamped or engraved marks. The word, however, never denotes the stamped figure or impression itself, but only the means for it. It may thus denote partly the features or marks which in general are the means of recognition, and partly may indicate the stamp itself; but this not merely as the external instrument, or tool for stamping, but as bearing in itself the form to be impressed, and having the destination and capacity by means of this of making the impression. In this sense PHILO (*ed. Mangey* I. p. 332) calls the rational soul a genuine coin which has obtained its οὐσία and its τύπος from that seal of God whose χαρακτήρ is the eternal Logos.

Bearing.—The character of the discourse will not allow our transforming the idea of φέρειν, *bearing*, into that of *maintaining* and *governing*. And, moreover, not merely do the later Jews frequently make use of this language, that God *bears* the worlds with His power and with the arm of His strength, but also Paul expresses a kindred idea thus: "all things *consist* (συνέστηκεν) in him," Col. i. 17. On the other hand this φέρειν must not be conceived as a mere *passive* bearing (*portare*); for the Son sustains no merely external relation to the world, nor in His action upon it merely puts forth His power in a manner like that ascribed to those who bore the heavens and the structure of the universe in the old mythologies; He acts through the word of His power. The 'Word' is not here that of the Gospel (Socin.) although *his* (αὐτοῦ) refers not to God (Cyril, Grot., *etc.*) but to the Son. It is the word in which the power essential to the Son utters itself, with which power it is itself fraught. The utterance of the Son, by which the world is upheld in its unity, and carried forward to the accomplishment of its purposes, is parallel to the creative word of God in the account of creation. The idea of *bearing* thus passes over into the active conception of *gerere* (*carrying forward*), of a sustaining movement and guidance which works upon and within it by an overmastering, spiritual agency. In this sense the prophets are said (2 Pet. ii. 4) to be φερόμενοι ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου, and the Sept. thus uses φέρειν, Num. xi. 14; Deut. i. 9.

Purification. — The expression, "making a purification of sins," refers not to an altered condition of the world wrought through the ministry of Christ, nor to a *moral renovation* of the human race effected in consequence of that ministry, but to the accomplished work of redemption in removing the hinderances created by sin to our intercourse with God. The form of expression is drawn from that Levitical worship in which only pure Israelites were permitted to take part. God, that is to say, has separated His people for His service, Lev. xx. 7; Numb. xvi. 5; that they may be His sanctified ones, His *Saints*, Ps. xvi. 3; Prov. xxx. 3. But the Saints are to be not merely corporeally pure, Ex. xix. 20; Deut. xxiii. 12–14; 1 Sam. xvi. 5, but also Levitically pure, Lev. xi. 44, since it is the business of those whom God has set apart from the nations as His possession, to observe the distinctions between the "clean" and the "unclean," which He Himself has established, Lev. xx. 24–26. Even though in all these arrangements we may not be able specially to refer back to death and corruption, as permanent tokens and memorials of sin (as SOMMER has with great acuteness attempted (*Bibl. Treatises*, Bonn, 1846, p. 183–367), still to the ceremonially defiled, equally as to the sinner, participation in the service was allowed only in consequence of priestly mediation on the ground of sacrifice, and thus alone access to God and appearance in His presence were rendered possible. To this our text refers, which, by the addition of τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, *of sins* (gen. obj. Ex. xxx. 10; Job vii. 21; comp. Matth. viii. 3), points specially to the purification from all sins, Lev. xvi. 30, which was made on the great day of atonement, and thus brings as definitely before the reader the *high-priestly work* of Christ as the words immediately following exhibit His kingly office. The Mid. form, ποιησάμενος, intimates a close and immediate relation of the action to the acting subject (KÜHNER *Gr.* § 250, (d), HADLEY *Gr. Gr.*, § 689). The act of purification is thus designated as the special and peculiar act of the Son. The reading δι' ἑαυτοῦ designates, at the same time, directly the person of Jesus Christ as the *means* of purification, and we must refer in our minds specially to the identity of the priest and of the expiatory sacrifice (ch. vii. 27; x. 10), as the ideas of purification and expiation stand in so close relation that כִּפֻּרִים, Ex. xxix. 36, is translated ἡμέρα τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ, *day of purification*, and 2 Macc. ii. 16, the feast of atonement is called καθαρισμός. Moreover, GRIMM (*Stud. und Krit.*, 1839, p. 751) regards as conjectural root of the Gothic *sauns* (*ransom*, λύτρον), the word *sinna*, *saun*=*to be pure*. KÖSTLIN's assertion (*Joh. Lehrbegr.*, p. 584) that the doctrine of our passage differs essentially from that of Paul, who makes atonement *vicarious*, is unfounded. The καθαρισμός wrought by the death of Christ is mentioned, Eph. v. 26; Tit. ii. 14, while again *substitution* appears, Heb. ix. 14: x. 10. Purification involves as its necessary condition, *cleansing;* as its *consequence*, *sanctification*, in the sense of *consecration*, ch. ix. 14, 22 f.; x. 2.

Took his seat. — Καθίζειν, in older classical use, is ordinarily transitive, but Hellenistic usage makes it generally *intransitive*, as elsewhere also constantly in our Epistle (viii. 1; x. 12; xii. 2); while with Paul again, except 2 Thess. ii. 4, it is uniformly transitive. Ἐν ὑψηλοῖς (corresponding to בַּמָּרוֹם, Ps. xciii. 4; as ἐν ὑψίστοις, Luke ii. 14; xix. 38; to בַּמְּרוֹמִים Job xvi 19) is grammatically to be referred to ἐκάθισεν, inasmuch as μεγαλωσύνη, *majesty*, (comp. viii. 1), like ἡ μεγαλοπρεπὴς δόξα, 2 Pet. i. 17, and δύναμις, Matth. xxvi. 64, is a designation of God in the respect that no greatness, power and majesty can reach to Him, compare itself with Him, or of itself attain to Him. The term "Majesty" has no need to be specialized by a defining clause like ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, a construction which (Beza, Bleek) would require the article (μεγαλωσύνης τῆς ἐν ὑψηλοῖς). But the phrase ἐν ὑψηλοῖς is important as added to ἐκάθισεν, describing more definitely Christ's exaltation after and by means of His ascension. We must not, however, with EBRARD, in the *Reformed* interest, maintain that ἐν ὑψ. contains a manifest local re-

lation, while the καθίζειν ἐν δεξιᾷ is a figurative expression, embracing purely the idea of participation in the Divine dominion and majesty, and utterly void of any *local* import. Inasmuch as the local relations are concrete and real, but yet can neither be sensibly beheld, nor are developed in the form of distinct conceptions in the Scriptures, but are revealed only in a general way to Christian apprehension, the figurative mode of expression and the local conceptions are neither to be dispensed with nor limited to a single isolated point. Such erroneous localization and possible misconceptions are in Scripture in part expressly and formally corrected, as John iv. 21, 50 ff.; Jer. xxiii. 23; 1 Kings viii. 27; partly set aside by counter statements, as at ch. iv. 14 Christ is said to have "passed *through* the heavens" (comp. Eph. i. 21; iv. 10, "who ascended *above* all heavens"); ch. vii. 14, to have become "higher than the heavens," and finally Acts vii. 55, Stephen sees Jesus *standing* at the right hand of God. Finally the original and primary conception involved in the phrase, "sitting at the right hand of God," is not that of participation in the fulness of the Divine power and honor, or in the exercise of universal dominion; but of being *taken into protection* under the sheltering presence of Jehovah from the assaults of enemies, Ps. cx. 1; Matth. xxii. 44; Rev. xii. 5. Only as a *consequence* of this follows participation in Divine honor, omnipotence and sovereignty; and this, in that the language is applied not to the theocratic kings in general, but to the Messiah, and, in its application to Jesus, presupposes, as its condition, His theanthropic exaltation. This sitting of the exalted Christ at the right hand of Majesty, which is to continue without interruption until His Second Coming, must be conceived, therefore, not as a state of *repose*, or of mere security, as of one rescued from his enemies, but of Messianic activity in the accomplishment of redemption. This activity may assume the most varied forms (Acts ii. 23; Rom. viii. 34; Heb. viii. 1); among them especially that of asserting the Divine dominion over all hostile assaults, and over all ungodly persons, Eph. i. 20; 1 Cor. xv. 25; Heb. ii. 8; x. 12; 1 Pet. iii. 22.

VER. 4. **Becoming.**—The participial clause, which at once forms the close of the period and introduces the capital thought of the immediately following discussion, gives, in contrast with what Christ, in His essential nature and under all circumstances, is and does, the *change* in position and dignity which He has experienced in His *actual* historical career. The word γενόμενος is neither to be taken separately nor unduly pressed. It stands in close connection with κρείττων (*becoming mightier, superior*); *ideo quæ non ad essentiæ ortum, sed ad conditionem pertinet* (MATTH. POLUS, *Synops. Crit.*). It is an error, however, to deduce from it the meaning *factus=declaratus;* and not less erroneous, on the other hand, is the rendering *existens* (Faber Stapul.), or the reference of the word, as with many older interpreters, to an *eterna generatio.* Nor does the term apply (as with Thom. Aquin., Cajet.) to the *act of incarnation*, or to Christ's investiture with the office of *Mediator*, "*quo pacto non uno modo factus dici potest*" (H. B. STARK, *Not. Sel.*, p. 4); but it refers to the *exaltation* of Him who had become incarnate (Theodoret, Œcumen.). Applied to Christ, it involves the idea of a change in the *mode* of His being and manifestation, but by no means in His nature, Rom. i. 3; Gal. iv. 4; Phil. ii. 7. It implies no apotheosis or exaltation of a *man* to Deity, but an actual exaltation of the Incarnate One as such into the place of Deity in the progress of a series of historical events. Κρείττων (=κρατύτερος) denotes not *of itself* Divinity (Cyrill), although the Greeks familiarly designated supernatural beings as οἱ κρείττονες. In its frequent use by our author it always denotes a *preëminence*, whose exact character is determined by the context. (See ch. ix. 19, 22; viii. 6; ix. 23; x. 34; xi. 16, 35, 40; xii. 24). Clem. Rom. (1 Cor. xxxvi.) in citing our passage, puts instead of it, μείζων. The formula τοσούτῳ—ὅσῳ, occurring in Philo and in our Epistle here, as also at ch. vii. 20–22; viii. 6; x. 25, is never used by Paul; nor is παρά after a comparative though frequent in our Epistle, as ch. iii. 3; ix. 23; xi. 4; xii. 24, and occurring Luke iii. 13; 3 Esdr. iv. 35. The comparative διαφορώτερον, found elsewhere in the New Testament only at viii. 6, enhances the idea of dignity which is already contained in the positive.

Name.—The term '*name*' (ὄνομα) is referred by Bez. and Calov, *etc.*, to the *dignity* and *glory* attained by Christ; by Akersloot to his extraordinary appellatives as *high-priest, Lord;* and by Del. to the aggregate heavenly name of the Exalted One, His שֵׁם הַמְפֹרָשׁ, *nomen explicitum*, which has entered no human mind on earth, and can be pronounced by no human tongue, ὄνομα ὃ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν εἰ μὴ αὐτός, Rev. xix. 12. The majority, however, refer the name to υἱός, *Son.* This view is sustained by the immediately following citations from the Old Testament, in proof that the name *Son*, used of an individual person, as such belongs exclusively to the Messiah; by the fact that while the name of 'Angel' points to the idea of servant and messenger, the name of Son, on the contrary, involves that of essential equality with the Father, of dominion and of heirship; and, finally, by the choice of the word 'inherited' (κεκληρονόμηκεν) which clearly refers back to the clause, "whom He constituted heir of all," while the perf. *has inherited*, shows that it relates not to an act parallel to, and simultaneous with, the ἔθηκε, after the resurrection, by which Christ obtained in His humanity, what in His divine nature He already possessed from eternity (Theodoret, Œcumen., Theophyl.), but to a complete and final *taking possession* of that which, as His befitting allotment, corresponding with His essential character, the Messiah has received once for all in permanent possession. The term refers not then to *absolute Sonship*, as a *relation* which Jesus may be supposed to have obtained on account of His merits, as His special allotment; but rather to that name of Son, challenging universal recognition (Phil. ii. 9), which Christ received, neither after His ascension nor at His conception (Sebast. Schmidt), Luke i. 35; but bears even in the Old Testament. CAMERO appropriately remarks: "He is not said to have inherited the *thing* which belonged to Him by nature, but the *name of the thing*, that, *viz.*, by

which it was known to angels and men that He Himself was the Son of God."

Angels.—The subsequent citations show that by ἄγγελοι we are to understand not the servants of God under the old covenant (Frenzel in *Augusti's Theol. Blätter, No.* 25. Haberfeld: *Angeli e primo et secundo cap. ep. ad Hebr. Exulantes.* Isenac. 1808), but the *heavenly angels.* The mention of them is not introduced casually, as if suggested by the mention of the Throne of God, and scarcely either for an independent polemical purpose, in opposition to Jewish Gnostic conceptions of the Messiah as an intermediate spirit and angel (Thol.) Ideas of this kind found, indeed, utterance among the Jews of this period, and had in part penetrated into the Christian church (Hellwag in the *Theol. Jahrb. Tübingen,* 1848. But no trace of an allusion to them is found in our Epistle whose purpose is to portray the infinite elevation of the new covenant, and of its perfect Founder above the old covenant, and its manifold and imperfect mediators. But to these intermediate agencies of the Old Testament belong essentially *Angelophanies*, which are expressly mentioned (ii. 2), in connection with the giving of the Law. Nor can any appeal be made to the Fourth Book of Esdras, and this, whether with Lawrence, Lücke and Hilgenfeld, we carry back the date of this book as early as the first century, B. C., or with Volkmar and Ewald (*the Fourth Book of Esdras, etc.*, 1868), bring it down to the first century after Christ, and with Dillman regard it as the work of a Hellenistic Jew, belonging to the last quarter of the first post-Christian century, exhibiting a Judaism which, after its rejection of Christianity, and after the Roman conquest of Palestine, is now in rapid progress toward its state of Talmudic ossification. For the Angels Uriel and Jeremiel are, indeed, in a certain sense, mediators of the revelations of God; they explain to Esra the visions which he has received, and answer the questions when and by whom God will introduce the judgment and the end of things, and others of like nature. But the Messiah is designated not as an angel, but as the Son of God (4 Esdr. vii., 28, 29) and beheld under the figure of the Lion from Judah, who annihilates the eagle, the symbol of the Roman Empire (4 Esdr. xi). In some features the apocalyptic representations assume a wild and monstrous character; while in the Book of Enoch, in the Jubilees, in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the contents taments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the contents of the revelation are at least recited from heavenly are given to Esra to be drunk in from a pitcher (4 Esdr. xiv. 40). Also in the *Book of Enoch,* (translated and explained by Dillman, Leipz., 1853) we find, indeed, an uncertain and inconsistent enumeration of angels, who are called in brief '*the white ones*' (ch. lxxxvii. 2; xc. 21, 31) or 'those who do not sleep' (ch. xxxix. 12; lxi. 12; lxxi. 7), and equally with the heroes (ch. xliii. 8; xlvi. 7) are often styled 'stars,' (ch. xxi. 3, 6; lxxxvi. 3; lxxxvii. 4; lxxxviii. 1, 3; xc. 21). There are also of these, different orders and proper names. At the head of the *Satane* stands Satan (ch. xl. 7) who (ch. liv. 5, 6; lv. 4) is also called Azazel, alongside of whom in the section ch. vi. 16 and lxxix. 2 appears Semjâzâ. Avenging angels are mentioned ch. liii. 3; liv. 3; lvi. 1; lxii. 11; lxiii. 1; lxxix. 28. Among the good angels by the throne of God are found three principal and highest leaders, Cherubim, Seraphim and Ophanim; ch. lxi. 10; lxxi. 7, and four supreme angels, Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, Phanuel, ch. xl. 4, 10; liv. 6; lxxi. 8, 13. In the sections that treat of Noah, Zuriel, (צוריאל) takes the place of Phanuel. At ch. xxi. 5, Uriel, and ch. xxiii. 4, Raguel are named as conductors of Enoch through heaven, while elsewhere also Michael ch. xxiv. 6, and Raphael, ch. xxiii. 3, 6; xxxii. 6, perform this service; though the proper calling of Raphael and Gabriel is healing and purifying, ch. x. 4, 10; xl. 9. The Messiah nowhere appears here as an angelic being, but as Son of a woman (lxii. 5), as Son of a man (lxix. 29), and Son of Man who has righteousness (xlvi. 1), who will be a staff to the righteous and holy, and the light of the nations; (xlviii. 4), whom also the angels praise (xl. 5). and who, with the Lord of Spirits and the head of days, as the anointed one (ch. xlviii. 10; lii. 4), who bears in Himself the fulness of the Divine Spirit (xlix. 2, 4), was chosen out and concealed before the world was created, ch. xlviii. 6. On the one hand the attributes which distinguish the members of the true church, are in the highest sense applied to the Messiah. He is hence called absolutely the Chosen One, ch. xl. 5; xlv. 3; xlviii. 2; li. 3, 5; lii. 6, 9; liii. 6; lv. 4; li. 5, 8, 10; lxii. 1, and the 'root' or the 'branch of righteousness,' ch. x. 16; xciii. 2, and as such, or as the righteous one, ch. xxxviii. 2; xcii. 2, 10, is distinguished from the Messianic people, who, in like manner, are conceived as plants of the eternal seed, ch. lxxxiv. 6, and is designated as the aggregate of the chosen, righteous and holy ones, ch. xxxviii. 2; xl. 2; xlv. 5; li. 5; lxi. 12, and hence also can collectively be called the righteous one, ch. xci. 10. On the other hand the Messiah is called absolutely the Word, ch. xc. 38; the Word of God, ch. xiv. 24; cii. 1, and the Son of God, ch. cv. 2, who will bear the sword of righteousness, and will appear in the eighth week of the world, ch. xci. 12. God, who is often called the "Ancient of Days," ch. xlvi. 1; xlvii. 3; lviii. 2; lxxi. 10, 13, (after Dan. vii. 13) swears before Michael, ch. lxix. 15 ff. that the salvation beheld by Enoch shall be eternal, and that the Messiah, as king of the kingdom of heaven, will establish on the earth an imperishable kingdom. Moreover, at ch. xxxix. 5; xlix. 1; lxii. 2, there is promised the outpouring of the Spirit of wisdom and righteousness. (Comp. Ewald: *Treatise on the Origin, Import and Construction of the Æthiopic Book of Enoch,* Gött., 1854, and Dillmann, who, in *Herzog's Real-Encycl.* XII., places the composition of ch. xxxvii–lxxi, after taking out the Noachian fragment—in the first decennium of the Hasmonean princes, that of the remaining sections in the time of the rule of John Hyrcanus, and that of the books of Noah in the first Christian century. Among these latest portions, in which, however, the Romans still do not appear as a secular power, dangerous to the Jews, he reckons ch. liv. 7–lv. 2; ch. lx., lxv.–lxix. 25; ch. cvi., and the greatest part of ch. vi.–16. The hypothesis defended by Hilgenfeld (*The*

Jewish Apocalyptic in its Historical development, Jena, 1857) of a Christian origin of ch. xxxvii.–lxxi. stands connected with other opinions of this scholar, and is refuted by Dillmann. This whole subject, however, is not yet thoroughly cleared up.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The character of the *historical* revelation of God, made to the fathers through the lips of prophets, and brought to perfection in the Son, is essentially different from that general manifestation of God in respect of His eternal power and Godhead (Rom. i. 20), which is made by means of His works and the rational nature of man. By its element of human speech it is immeasurably exalted above that Symbolical language of nature which stands in need of a special interpretation. It avails itself indeed, in like manner, of imagery for the expression of ideas that lie beyond the sphere of sense. But this imagery belongs to human speech as such, and God avails Himself of it for the purpose of direct address to certain men, in setting home positive communications which He makes in the way of direct personal approach and appeal. This revelation in language presupposes the religious vitality of man, and aims at its development, purification and perfection. As containing the word of God, this revelation actually solves the problem of His relation to the world, of its creation, preservation and redemption: it unveils to us His counsels and procedure in respect to salvation; shows us the destination of the world, and the Divine arrangements for its recovery, government, and ultimate blessedness; and thus sheds light alike on the true nature of God, and on the history of our race.

2. The *fragmentary* character of this revelation produces in it no error; for God is He who speaks to us in the prophets, and all the utterances of revelation are oracles of God (λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ). The great *variety of its forms* best bears testimony to the goodness of God in graciously condescending to human necessities, and demonstrates at once the sincerity and earnestness with which He draws near to us, and the depth of His condescension. For God did not use the prophets as merely passive instruments, nor speak through them as through a speaking trumpet; nor did He merely "exercise His power in them, and inspire in their mind and heart what, when and how they were to speak," 2 Pet. i. (Starke). He deposited His own thoughts in the prophetic modes and forms of thought, and clothed His own word in the peculiarities of speech which belonged to the prophet and to his time. It is precisely for this reason that in the prophetic writings of the Old Testament the discourse frequently passes from the third person to the first, and conversely, and that without indication of any change in the person of the speaker.

3. The fact that the *same* God has spoken to us at an earlier period in the prophets, and, at the close of the Ante-Messianic period, in the Son, assures to us the *unity*, amidst its manifold variety, of the historical revelation; while it teaches us that the individual utterances mutually illustrate each other, and yet derive their full light only from the actual central point of all revelation, Jesus Christ. For which reason also the Old Testament is rightly understood only from the stand-point of the New, and the entire body of Scripture is to be regarded in the light of a revelation of God for the salvation of the world, whose parts stand related to each other as preparation and fulfilment.

4. The *successive stages* of Revelation (Rosenm., *Treatise on the successive stages of Divine Rev.*, 1784) point to a divine plan of salvation, which, ordained from eternity, has in its execution in time, given birth to a completely adjusted economy of salvation, and discloses a wisdom into whose mysteries Angels desire to look, 1 Pet. i. 12, and to whom it is made known in the church of Jesus Christ, Eph. iii. 10, as also to us to whom the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, has given the spirit of wisdom and revelation for the knowledge of Himself, Eph. i. 17. The answer of Cyrill (*adv. Julian*, IV. 126) to the inquiry of the emperor Julian regarding the reason of the *lateness* of Christ's appearance, *viz.*, that "Revelation advances with advancing culture, and its perfection could be reached only in connection with a corresponding culture of the race," is an answer at once erroneous and puerile. More to the purpose remarks Heubner: "Christianity completes the circle of Revelation; it is its perfection, and stands good for the highest reach of culture which man can attain on earth."

5. The designation of God's revelation in the Son as the *final* one, while decidedly repelling the idea that any grade of human culture can transcend, and leave behind it Christianity as a thing antiquated and effete, remands to the realm of dreams every anticipation of a new revelation in behalf of some religion of the future. And the declaration—that Christ, *only after accomplishing* a purification of sin, took his seat at the right hand of the Majesty on high, reminds us that there can be no degree of human need which should require another religion. "If God has finally spoken to us by Christ and His Apostles, we must not turn away to the next doctrine that may arise, be it Mohammedanism or Popery; but abide by that which we heard from the beginning from Christ and His Apostles; and so abiding we shall abide with the Father and the Son." (Starke).

6. In the fact that *through the Son*, in whom God has spoken to us in the fulness of times, He originally *made the worlds*, is involved the possibility of a perfect harmony in natural and historical revelation. But the apostasy and its consequences have changed their original relation. The realization of this harmony must be brought about by a complete triumph over sin, and an accomplished elimination of evil from the world, and will be effected not by any heightened development on the part of nature, but by the special acts of God in a series of historical revelations.

7. While Jesus Christ is *placed on a level* with the prophets in that—according to the rule, Amos iii. 7: "Jehovah does nothing without revealing His counsel to His servants, the prophets,"—He is a personal organ for genuine oracles of God, He stands essentially distinguished from them

not exclusively in the fact of His being the perfect *Mediator of the final revelation*, of whom all earlier prophets have prophesied. For in this case He might possibly have been conceived merely as the most perfect teacher and the most distinguished prophet. The *specific distinction* lies in the three following points: 1. Christ is become *king* at the right hand of the Majesty in heaven, while the prophets have been and remain simply servants of Jehovah. 2. Christ is *Saviour* and *Redeemer* of the world, which presupposes His personal *purity* from every sin; the prophets, on the contrary, were at all times sinful men who stood in need of redemption. 3. The exaltation of Jesus Christ to divine Majesty after accomplishing on earth the work of redemption, corresponds to His ante-mundane condition and life, to His eternal relation as Son to the Father, and to his *supra-mundane* character and work; so that in His personal appearance on earth He is to be designated as *God-man* (ϑεάνϑρωπος), while the prophets, as men of God, who have spoken under the impulse of the Holy Ghost, maintained and attested their created and finite character.

8. That the historical Mediator of the final revelation of God is the *ante-mundane Mediator of the creation of the world*, imparts to Him a special majesty and dignity beyond that of all created mediators. The comparison of Him with the Angels shows that He is not, in this relation, conceived as an unconscious intermediate cause, but has exercised this mediating agency *in a personal existence.* And the declaration that He is the beaming image of God's glory and the impress of His substance, shows that the Mediator who is distinguished above all beings, and even above the Angels, by the name of "Son," does not bear His filial name in a conventional and theocratic sense. "The Son is the mediating essence of the whole spiritual world, in whom the Deity presents Himself in that world, mirrored in all His perfections, in power, wisdom, holiness, love. Such is the *external* relation of the Son; for the world, for us, He is the being from whom beams forth the divine δόξα. The ground of this is that on Him is impressed and stamped the divine essence; that He is Himself participant of the divine nature. This language expresses the *Son's internal* character and relation." (Heubner). Hence, Ignatius (*ad Magnes.* 5) strikingly styles the renewing of the Christian into the image of God a recoining by virtue of a new stamp which God applies through Jesus Christ; and Origen, (*ad Rom.* iv. 2) remarks that in this *transformation* is explained the fact that the world does not know the true disciples of Jesus. The Son appears not as a revealer *unequal* to the Father, and hence an inadequate revealer of some part or a single side of His nature; but He is here designated as the perfect co-equal revealer of the Father (v. Gerlach), in whom the 'form of God' (μορφὴ ϑεοῦ) permanently dwells, Phil. ii. 6, and whom Paul designates (Col. i. 15) the "first-born of the whole creation (πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως) and the image (εἰκὼν) of the invisible God;" since the essential form of God is that εἶδος ϑεοῦ (John v. 37) which the Son essentially possessed in His pre-incarnate glory, John xvii. 5. The declaration then, that He, as Son, has issued from the Father, and is dependent on Him, implies not a temporal but an eternal relation, involving no succession in time, no subordination in power or rank, no lowering of the divine attributes. As light of light He is not a mere ray of the divine Majesty, but sun from sun, because God from God, *a personal subsistence of the divine substance.*

9. In the ascription to the Son of the essential attribute that he bears (sustains, moves, and guides) all things with the word of His power, believers may find an ample consolation. The Lord of the Church is the Lord over the world; the mediator of revelation and salvation is also the mediator of the maintenance and government of the world; the Saviour of sinners is the controller of the history and the destinies of all men and things. The Roman Clement styles Him (1 Cor. xvi.) "the outstretched sceptre of the divine majesty," and Paul says Col. i. 17, that in Him all things are, as consisting and held together in Him. Without His mediating agency the world would fall asunder alike in its elements, and its moving forces. But as it is, neither nature nor the course of events can hinder the victory of the Church of Christ, the triumph of believers, the accomplishment of all things according to the divine plan.

10. In the word 'heir' lies a relation not merely to the name of *Son*, or to the fact that the Son has received, according to Matth. xxviii. 18, universal dominion, but at the same time, and chiefly to the *Messianic* fulfilment of the promises given Rom. iv. 13 to the *seed of Abraham*, on which foundation rests the promise that we are to be heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ, Rom. viii. 17. The expression reminds us not so much that Jesus Christ is the second Adam (Calv.), as rather that He is ὁ ἐρχόμενος, *He that cometh.* "What belongs to God belongs to Christ. Only, therefore, as we have part in Christ can we claim a share in the riches of God." (Fricke.)

11. Having descended by His incarnation into a lower position than that held by the Angels, in so far as these are spirits and dwellers in heaven, (ch. ii. 7, 9) the Messiah, after accomplishing His redemptive work, has, by an actual historical change in the circumstances of His life, passed into a position as much transcending that of Angels in majesty and power, as His characteristic *name* is nobler and loftier than theirs. "*Non naturam sed personam Christi hic confert cum Angelis respectu dignitatis, officii, potentiæ, et gloriæ.*" (Matt. Polus, *Synops. crit.*, iv. 1125, ed. Francf.). As in Christ the personal union of the divine and human natures is in the most perfect manner accomplished, while yet the two natures are in no way confounded, the two thus remain always distinguishable, yet are never to be conceived as actually separated. We must regard, therefore, as erroneous the language of so many earlier writers who limit the *exaltation* exclusively to the human nature of Christ. It applies rather, as already remarked by Œcumenius (II. 320), *to the person of the God-man.*

12. "Although Christ with His body has ascended above all heavens, yet in relation to His ubiquity we are to distinguish the two *kinds of His actual presence*, according as this presence belongs merely to His *bodily nature*, or to His

personality. Under the former relation He is, in His present condition, in a certain *ποῦ* (*where*), not indeed circumscribed within strictly *local* limits, but such as, while transcending time and place, still belong to a finite essence, and subject it, therefore, to like conditions with all the glorified bodies of the blessed. In the other relation, Christ, by virtue of His personal unity, and of that divine majesty and glory which He shares, is no less present every where to all creatures than the Logos itself." (OETINGER, *Idea vitæ*, § 119). "The words that speak of His *departure* and *re-appearing* do not exclude His bodily presence, of which He indeed gives express assurance, Matth. xxviii. 18, but distinguish merely the dissimilar modes of His presence—bearing one form before His passion, another at the final judgment, and still another during the intervening period." (SIM. MUSÆUS, *Sermon on the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ*, 1561.). Whatever be the special explanations, the emphasis laid by the Lutheran church on the *personal presence, ministry*, and *self-communication* of Christ, and that too of the *whole* and *undivided* Christ in His Church, is but a thoroughly authorized and justifiable practical application of the Scripture teaching regarding the sitting of the God-man at the right hand of Majesty in the highest heavens.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The unity of Revelation amidst the variety of its manifestations: 1. as unity of the author, God; 2. as unity of the means, the word of God; 3. as unity of its purpose, the salvation of the world.—Whereby does the one revelation of the true God present itself so variously that only the believer can comprehend its unity? 1. By the diversity of the *times* of which God regards the necessities; 2. by the different character of the *persons* in whom God has spoken to men; 3. by the peculiar and various *modes of intercourse and expression* which God has made use of.—Christ the sole and single, because perfect mediator, 1. of the existence of the world in respect to *a.* its creation, *b.* its preservation, *c.* its government; 2. of the revelation of God to the world in respect to *a.* His power, *b.* His will, *c.* His essence; 3. of the saving of the world in *a.* its redemption, *b.* its sanctification, *c.* its final perfection as the kingdom of God.—Wherein we Christians are at once like and unlike the Israelites? 1. In our possession of the word of true Revelation; 2. in our faith in the coming of the Messiah; 3. in our hope of salvation by purification from sin.—The *antitheses* in Jesus Christ: 1. in His person as God and man; 2. in His history, as one of humiliation and exaltation.—The threefold office of Jesus Christ: 1. as that of the perfect prophet in whom the revelation through the word has found its completion and close; 2. as that of the true high-priest who offered Himself for purification from sin; 3. as that of eternal king who, elevated above all created existence, bears and rules over all things.—The *dominion* of Jesus Christ: 1. in its character, *a.* by the word of revelation, *b.* by the word of His power, *c.* by the word of His grace; 2. in its establishment, *a.* by His nature, *b.* by His works, *c.* by His place at the right hand of Majesty on high; 3. in its extent, *a.* in time, *b.* in space, *c.* in respect to its objects.—The Lord always governs His church, 1. by virtue of His personal life with the Father in glory, 2. by virtue of the accomplishment of the work of redemption committed to Him, 3. by means of the word in which His Spirit bears sway and His power works.—The threefold relation of Jesus Christ to God: 1. as servant, 2. as Son, 3. as joint-ruler.—The peculiar and unique relation of Jesus Christ, our Saviour, 1. to men, 2. to God, 3. to the entire universe.—The completed and perfected life of our Lord Jesus Christ is 1. the pledge of our deliverance, 2. the type of our glorification, 3. the means of our union with God.—The significance of the elevation of Jesus Christ to the right hand of Majesty on high, 1. for the personal life of the Lord, 2. for the faith of His disciples, 3. for the progress of His work, 4. for the destiny of the world, 5. for the completion of the revelation of God.—What abides to us amidst the vicissitudes of times and the change of all things? 1. The *word* of God which *a.* in manifold ways, *b.* by virtue of divine constitution and arrangement, *c.* reveals to us eternal truth; 2. the *Son* of God who *a.* as image of His substance, *b.* after accomplishing His mission on earth, *c.* sits at the right hand of the Majesty on high; 3. the *salvation* of God, which in Christ is *a.* destined for us from eternity, *b.* obtained for us in time, *c.* and for all eternity imparted to believers.—Whither do all our Sabbaths and religious services summon us? 1. Into the church whose *a.* Founder, *b.* Saviour, and *c.* Head is the Son of God; 2. to devotional contemplation *a.* of His word, *b.* of His ways, *c.* of His works; 3. to believing appropriation *a.* of revealed truth, *b.* of the proffered cleansing from sin, *c.* of the opened access to the Majesty of God.—The homage which we owe to Christ: 1. in its origin and procurement *a.* by His divine sonship, *b.* by His mediatorial office, *c.* by His position at the right hand of God; 2. in its *expression* *a.* in acknowledgment of that which we receive from Him, *b.* in the use of that which we have through Him, *c.* in the striving after that which we hope from Him.—For what shall the name which distinguishes Christ above all other beings, serve us? 1. To remind us of that image of God for which we are created; 2. to assure us of the Sonship for which we are redeemed; 3. to aid us on our way to the glory to which we are called.—Whither does the preaching of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, direct our eyes? 1. To the eternity *a.* from which He came, *b.* of which He bore witness, *c.* to which He is gone; 2. to the ways of God, *a.* in upholding, *b.* in enlightening, *c.* in purifying the world; 3. to our personal position *a.* in respect to the word, *b.* to the people, *c.* to the Son of God.

BERLENBURGER BIBLE: We must not fancy, now that we have the Scripture, that we need not the teaching of Christ, and that He therefore may remain dumb. Rather must we reverse the position and say: precisely *because* we have the Scripture, Christ must speak and explain it to us. This is Christ's proper office and work; this the Father has assigned to Him; this He will not allow to be taken from Him, and of so rich a blessing the believing Christian must

not allow himself to be deprived.—The Holy Scripture of the Old Testament is the morning dawn and day-break, which thence advances to meridian day.—Articles of faith are not like other things, learned out, as it were, and rendered antiquated. Rather might the Hebrews now well profit by their former teachings and lessons. Among these stands conspicuous the course of God's providential dealings, up to the time of Him who was to come.—The Jews of our time close up their door, and shove to this bolt, and say: We adhere to Moses! They are not fond of reading the prophets. But the Christian religion is no falling away from the Fathers, but a fulfilment of that which God spoke to them.—People often convert into a stumbling-block that which they should have employed as a help.—We must not narrow up the time of Christ to the years of His flesh, but regard Him as being of eternity, who is styled God of the whole world, Is. liv. 5.—Redemption belongs to the kingdom of grace; but the being who was to redeem us was required of necessity to be mighty. Grace and power mutually aid and sustain each other.—STEINHOFER: The Lord would fain receive honor from his inheritance, and that inheritance are we. We are the work of His hands, and are indebted to Him for life and being. We are a fruit of His painful toil, and have through Him our salvation. We are His peculiar heritage, presented to Him by the Father for an ornament and a delight. His purpose shall succeed; the work of His hand shall not be in vain; His honor shall be secured to Him by His grace in us, His own inheritance.—DERS: Jesus is able to make known and execute the whole purpose of God. For this great and glorious work, for which He was destined from Eternity, He was 1. not too mean or insignificant, since He is the splendor of God's majesty and the image of His substance. Nor was He for this 2. too weak and impotent: for He it is who bears all things with the Word of His power. 3. He evinced himself to be the Son appointed to the inheritance, in that He left not the obstacles to be removed by a stranger; but became Himself the sacrifice, and made through Himself a purification of our sins.—The course of the Son of God from the bosom of the Father to His throne.—He has made by Himself the purification of our sins: 1. Without this mission and message all the attestations to His glory would be to us matter rather of terror than of joy; 2. but with the Word of His grace the recognition of His majesty becomes matter of at once weighty and delightful import: 3. The experience of the forgiveness of sins in His blood draws our hearts so that we delight to adore Him.

STARKE: God always reserves the best unto the last. Although He may not give thee speedily what thou desirest, at last *all* will turn out good, Ps. xxxvii. 37; Hab. ii. 3.—Christ obtains the inheritance for all those who adhere to Him. We are through Christ all children, and heirs of God. Are we then not sufficiently rich? I have but little in the world, and have but a small inheritance to leave behind me; yet I am not therefore sad. Though poor here I shall be abundantly rich in heaven, Rom. viii. 17.—Though the one only God has spoken formerly through the prophets to the fathers, and at last to us by His Son; yet, as there is only one God, has there been also but one religion, one faith, one worship, and one way to eternal bliss from the beginning of the world until now, Acts xv. 11.—I adhere to Christ; He has all power. He knows what is my ability; I believe that He will help me always and everywhere, John iv. 4.—Jesus exalted into heaven, and yet, as God and man, at all times present with His church on earth by virtue of inseparable, personal union. If he is there and here, then why so troubled, my heart? If thou diest, thou comest into heaven to Jesus. So long as thou livest, Jesus is with thee. Jesus, thy magnet, will finally draw thee wholly to Himself, John xvii. 24.—To dwell on the name of Christ is a blessed work, for one learns thus to know His great glory, John xvii. 8.

HEUBNER: We have here a comprehensive outline of all Christology: 1. what Christ is in Himself: 2. what He is to us; Revealer of God, Ransomer of sinners; 3. into what condition He is exalted.—How important is it to have a genuine, Scriptural, adequate conception of Christ! The more value we attach to Christ, so much the more value do we attach to His Word; so much the more sacred He becomes as an example; so much the more power issues forth from Him; so much the more unlimited is the confidence which we can repose in Him.

[OWEN: All the glorious perfections of the nature of God do belong unto, and dwell in, the person of the Son. Were it not so, He could not gloriously represent unto us the person of the Father; nor by the contemplation of Him could we be led to an acquaintance with the person of the Father. The whole manifestation of the nature of God unto us, and all communications of grace, are immediately by and through the person of the Son. He represents Him unto us; and through Him is everything that is communicated unto us from the fulness of the Deity conveyed.]

II.

Scripture proof of the elevation of Jesus Christ as Son of God, and being above the Angels.

CHAPTER I. 5-14.

5 For to which of the angels said he at any time: Thou art my Son, this day have
I begotten thee? And again: I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a
6 Son? And again: When he bringeth in [and when he shall a second time[1] have in-
troduced ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ, 2 *Aor. Subj.=Perf. Fut.*] the First-begotten into the
7 world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him. And of [in respect, in-
deed, to] the angels he saith, who maketh his angels spirits [winds] and his minis-
8 ters a flame of fire; but unto [in respect to] the Son he saith: Thy throne, O God, is
for ever and ever: a [And[1]: a] sceptre of righteousness [rectitude εὐθύτητος] is the
9 sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved [lovedst ἠγάπησας] righteousness, and hast
hated [hatedst ἐμίσησας] iniquity[2]; therefore God, even thy God, [O God, thy
10 God] hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. And, thou,
Lord, in the beginning hast laid [didst lay] the foundations of the earth; and the
11 heavens are the works of thy hands: they shall perish, but thou remainest,[3] and they
12 all shall wax old as doth a garment, and as a vesture[4] shalt thou fold [roll][5] them up,
and they shall be changed. But thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.
13 But to [and in respect to] which of the angels said he at any time [hath he ever
said εἴρηκέν ποτε], sit on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool?
14 Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs
of salvation [for ministration for the sake of those (διὰ τούς) who are to inherit sal-
vation?]

[1] Ver. 8.—*Καί* introducing the second portion of the passage from the Psalm is found in Sin, A. B. D.* E.* M. xvii. Itala according to Cod. Clarom. and Vulg. according to Cod. Amiat. In the following words the lect. Rec. should be retained.

[2] Ver. 9.—Sin. reads with the Cod. Alex. of the LXX. ἀδικίαν. The remaining MSS. except some minusc., read with the Cod. Vat. of the LXX. ἀνομίαν [ἀδικίαν was perhaps written in accidental conformity to the preceding δικαιοσύνη.—K.]

[3] Ver. 11.—Instead of the pres. διαμένεις Bleek, following Itala., Vulg. *etc.*, accents διαμενεῖς as future.

[4] Ver. 12.—Sin. A. B. D.* E. have further the clause ὡς ἱμάτιον after αὐτούς.

[5] Ver. 12.—The ἀλλάξεις of the original is found also in Sin. D.* 43. The remaining Codd. read ἑλίξεις, perhaps with an indistinct reference to Is. xxxiv. 4.

[Ver. 6.—*And when he shall have again introduced, etc.* Both the position of πάλιν, and the connection of the thought, point decidedly to this construction. The reference is (de W., Lün., Ebr., Del., Alf., Moll.) to the re-introduction of Christ into the inhabited world (ἡ οἰκουμένη) at His second coming. It may be rendered *again*, a *second time*, or *back;* both ideas being in fact included.

Ver. 7.—*In respect indeed to*=while in respect to. The force of the part. μέν, making v. 7 preparatory to v. 8 is lost in Eng. ver., as in many other passages in the Epistle. In v. 8 πρός with τὸν υἱόν should be rendered as in v. 7. *In respect to the Son*. So also I think it should be (with Moll) at v. 13, and so I think (as against Moll, and nearly all the Intpp.) at xi. 18, πρὸς ὃν ἐλαλήθη.—πνεύματα clearly here *winds*, not *spirits*, as demanded by the connection.

Ver. 9.—[" O God, thy God," ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός σου. Even Del. is doubtful whether in v. 9 the first ὁ θεός should be rendered, as in ver. 8, as Voc. 'O God', or, as in apposition with the following: 'God, thy God.' With Lün., Moll, *etc.*, I think we are clearly to prefer the former construction.

Ver. 14.—Εἰς διακονίαν for *service* or *ministration*, not to men, but to God. Their ministration or service is to *God;* but in His service they are sent forth *on account of*, *for the sake of* (διά) men.—K.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

To which of the angels said he at any time.—The position of the words τίνι γὰρ εἶπεν ποτε τῶν ἀγγέλων shows that the emphasis is to be laid immediately upon τίνι and τῶν ἀγγέλων, and that ποτέ does not belong to τίνι as a strengthening particle, *to whom I pray? Cui tandem?* (Chr. F. Schmid, Kuinoel, *etc.*), but is a particle of *time*. The subject is God. This, however, is not so much to be drawn from ver. 1, as to be supplied from the connection of the thought according to usage in citing from the Old Testament. It cannot be urged in refutation of the author's reasoning, that in the Old Testament alike men and angels *are* sometimes called Sons of God. Schlicht., Michael., and Böhme have pointed out the difference between a collective appellative, and the name applied to an individual. This, however, does not meet the case, although the τίνι would seem to favor it. Bleek's explanation that the LXX. cited exclusively by our author, read in the Cod. Alex. Gen. vi. 2, 4; Job i. 6; ii. 1; xxxviii. 7; Dan. iii. 25, not *Sons* (υἱοί) but *Angels* (ἄγγελοι) of God, is insufficient from the fact that in the Ps. xxix. 1; lxxxix. 7, we find the expression "*Sons* of God," and we are not at liberty to suppose that the author forgot or left out of the account these passages. The remark, too, of Primasius that, as applied to other beings, the name stands only *abusively*,

only in a subordinate sense, explains not the real relations of the case (since the real connecting links of the thought remain unmentioned), and evades the objection, as does also the remark of Tholuck that the author presupposes that his readers would take the appellation given specially to an individual *in a more exalted sense*=πρωτότοκος. More relevant to the context is the explanation of Braun that men and angels bore the name not as a rightful inheritance entailed upon them in accordance with their nature, but as received only by *adoption;* yet even this is partly erroneous, partly imperfect. The decisive consideration is suggested by Ebr. and Del. There is, at the outset, an essential distinction between the dwelling of heavenly, yet still created beings, with *Elohim*, and *being begotten by Jehovah*. This latter form of expression which never occurs in reference to angels, indicates the relation in question as resting not on a natural, but on a *theocratic* basis. Precisely for this reason Jehovah can say, "My Son, my first-born is Israel" (Ex. iv. 22), and: "My Father, shall ye call to me," Jer. iii. 14, 19; xxxi. 20; Is. i. 8; Deut. xiv. 1. Israel's exodus was the day of His birth (Hos. ii. 5); and the days up to the formation of the covenant on Sinai, those "days of old," and of the "years of many generations" (Deut. xxxii. 7; Is. li. 9), constitute the *youthful period* of the Church (Hos. xi. 1), in which Jehovah bore the Israelites as the father the son; in which He led them, and "taught them to go," as a mother does her child (Hos. xi. 8; Am. ii. 10); in which He delivered the people from the house of bondage, and brought them to His own house that they might be closely united with Him forever, Ex. iii. 7; xx. 2. This is the time of bridal tenderness and of youthful love, when Israel became the Lord's possession and His first-fruit, Jer. ii. 2, 8; Ezek. xvi. 8; since Jehovah has Himself brought His people to Himself, and borne them on eagles' wings (Ex. xix. 6; Deut. xxxii. 12), so that they became at once an independent nation and a church of the Lord, Ex. xix. 8; Ezek. xvi. 4; xx. 5. Granting that thus not merely pious servants of Jehovah in general (Deut. xiv. 1; Ps. lxxiii. 15; Prov. xiv. 26), but pre-eminently theocratic rulers (Ps. lxxxix. 27), and specially those springing from the seed of David (2 Sam. vii. 14) are called *Sons of God*, (nay, that even heathen Princes (Ps. lxxxii. 6), over whom God exercises judgment, are, in their official position, called "Gods" and "Sons of the Most High"), it follows, on the one hand, that, in the theocratic sense, the name in question has never been given to an angel; and it is clear, on the other, that on this theocratic basis the specific relation of Christ to God might disclose itself as a fact of revelation, and that a *Christological* interpretation of the Old Testament is possible without disturbing the *historical foundation* of the Messianic passages.

My Son—shall be to me a Son.—Through the two passages Ps. ii. and 2 Sam. vii. cited by him with like application, the author goes back to the germ of the Messianic prophecy in the narrower and stricter sense. When David designed the building of a temple on Mount Zion in fulfilment of Ex. xv. 17; Deut. xii. 5, he received, through the prophet Nathan, the divine declaration that not he, but his son, after him, was to build a temple to Jehovah; nay, that for this seed God would, on His part, build a house, and establish His throne forever; that Jehovah would be to him a father, and he should be to Him a son, vii. 14. In a prayer of David accompanying this prophetic assurance, David expresses the conviction that the complete fulfilment of this prophecy is reserved to the remote future. The following words, however (ver. 19), mean not: "and this in a man who shall be the Lord Jehovah Himself" (Ebr. and the older interpreters), but: "And this (hast Thou spoken) after the manner of man (or as man speaks with man), Thou who art God the Lord." In this condescension of God so fully does David recognize a prerogative bestowed upon him that in the parallel passage (1 Chron. xvii. 17) he says: "Thou hast regarded me as a man of very high degree." Thus a *filial* relation is described as that which the posterity of David will sustain to God, and this posterity conceived not merely in its aggregate or collective character, but *individually*. We hence refer the language immediately to Solomon who, with express reference to this prophecy, undertakes the building of the temple (1 K. viii. 17 ff.), and regards himself as this promised Son (1 K. v. 5; 2 Chron. vi. 9), as does also David, 1 Chron. xxii. 9 ff.; xxix. 19. But through this seed the royal dominion is to be established forever to the house of David, 2 Sam. vii. 16. And Solomon immediately declares (1 K. viii. 26, 27) that this temple reared by him is not a house in which God may properly dwell. Men must of necessity, therefore, while David slept with his fathers, direct their eye farther into the future; as in fact David himself, 1 Chron. xvii. 17, beholds the promised seed in a long and blessed succession, and there is here no mention, as 2 Sam. vii. 14 of transgressions, which God will visit with a paternal chastisement. For the question is not of the *form*, as such, of the kingdom, however glorious it might be, in fulfilment of the prediction Num. xxiv. 17: "A star shall arise out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall arise out of Israel, and will dash in pieces the corners of Moab, and will destroy all the children of pride;" nor is *mere descent from David* sufficient to ensure the receiving of the everlasting kingdom, Ps. lxi. 7 ff., which God has confirmed to David with an oath, Ps. xviii. 51; lxxxix. 50 ff.; cxxxii. 11 ff. We have here rather to do with a *theocratic kingdom under a theocratic ruler*, who goes forth to battle amidst the offerings and prayers of his people (Ps. xx.), and who, with God as auxiliary, will annihilate all his enemies, but will righteously administer the princely gifts and prerogatives with which he has been entrusted, Ps. xxi. Of this ruler David stands as a type, and he himself, at the close of his life, makes the declaration, 2 Sam. xxiii. 4: "A righteous ruler in the fear of God is as the light of the sun which arises in a morning without clouds, like the tender grass which after the rain springs forth from the earth." For this reason God builds again the fallen tabernacle of David as in the ancient times, Am. ix. 1, after Israel has been sifted out as one sifts out grain, ver. 9. And the ruler through whom the dominion returns back to the "tower of the flock" of David, and to the "strong hold" of Zion,

Mic. iv. 8, will not merely have his historical descent from the house of David, Mic. v. 1, but as "the branch," the "shoot," "the stem from the root of Jesse," Is. xi. 1, 10, the righteous branch (Is. iv. 2; Jer. xxiii. 5; xxxiii. 15; Zech. iii. 8; vi. 12), whom God will raise up to David (Jer. xxx. 9; Ez. xxxiv. 23; xxxvii. 24), is called even by the *name* of David, Jer. xxx. 9; Ez. xxxvii. 24, 25; comp. Hos. iii. 5; and "the sure mercies of David," Is. lv. 3, are a designation of the Messianic salvation. As now this Majestic one, who issues from the nation itself, as a ruler from its midst, is to draw near unto Jehovah Himself, Jer. xxx. 21, nay, is to bear the name "Jehovah our Righteousness" (Jer. xxiii. 6; liii. 15), it is clear that in the view of prophecy the Messianic salvation is linked to a son of David who is an "Anointed One" not merely in the sense in which even foreign kings as Cyrus, Is. xlv. 1, and Hazael, 1 K. xix. 15, receive this name as being instruments of Jehovah, and in which the theocratic kings in general bear it, 1 Sam. ii. 10; Ps. xx. 7; cxxxii. 10, *etc.*, but in a special sense which includes, besides the kingly, also the prophetic, Is. lxi. 1, and the priestly anointing, so that Zechariah (vi. 12, 13) may say: "Behold a man, Branch is his name, who will spring up in his place and build the temple of Jehovah,—he will bear kingly adornment, and will sit and rule upon his throne, and will be priest upon his throne, and there will be harmony between the two." When, now, this Messiah is regarded as standing to God in the relation of Son to the Father, we can see in this only the full *perfection* of the Theocratic relation. The designating of the stock of Ephraim, Jer. xxxi. 9, as the dear son and confidential child of God, shows that this language points to an intimate relation of communion and love. But that the term referred primarily not to subjective excellence, but to an objective relation, appears from Zech. xiii. 7, where the wicked Pekah is styled by God "the man that is my fellow;" and while Ex. iv. 22 shows that at the same time the origin of the nation in this, its peculiar relation to God, is, in the expression, "First-born Son," referred back to God Himself, so Ps. lxxxix. 27, 28 brings out with special clearness at once the dignity of the relation, involving the manifold prerogatives of the first-born, and also the traits of trustful devotion and hope, in the language: "He (David) will cry unto me, Thou art my Father, my strength, and the rock of my salvation. And I will make him my First-Born, supreme above the kings of the earth." In the application of these expressions to the Messiah, their *form* indeed allows the possibility of a deeper conception of His origin and of His issuing forth from God. But this deeper conception, which finds expression in the New Testament, we are not directly to transfer to the words of the Old. We find nowhere in the Old Testament a clearly developed and conscious apprehension of the eternal and *immanent* relation of the Son to the Father. Even Micah v. 1 scarcely declares definitely the preëxistence of the Messiah, or His eternal destination in the purpose of God; but from the completely humbled condition of the house of David, it simply assures us that beyond any known and historical record of the life and lineage of the Deliverer, who is to be born in the humble Bethlehem, we must go indefinitely back for His issuing forth, or origin, which is from ancient times, from "the days of old." In a manner equally indefinite as to chronology, but significant and fraught with ominous import as to the facts, is in that passage indicated the time of His coming. For it is immediately added that Jehovah will give over the Israelites until the time when she who is with child shall bear her offspring. Among the attributes of the Messiah, too, is found, Is. ix. 5, the title, 'Father of eternity,' but not the 'Son of eternity.' The 'Son,' Is. ix. 8, stands parallel to the 'child' whose birth is to be looked for. Yet, on the other hand, the profounder New Testament conception has not merely the *formal* right of an external connection with the Old Testament form of expression, but the higher and essential right of an unfolding of those germs which the veil of the Old Testament only so conceals, that in their intrinsic nature they at the same time point beyond themselves and those present circumstances in which they had their origin. This is shown particularly in Ps. ii., here cited, which presupposes as an historical fact the prediction of Nathan, and displays its early acknowledged Messianic character in the fact that it speaks of a world-subduing power of the King whom Jehovah Himself has established upon Zion (erroneously translated by earlier scholars: 'anointed at Zion') and placed in the relation of Son to Jehovah—the King whom the author of the Psalms, ver. 12, styles "the Son"—and that this Son appeals *for* this relation, on which the futile endeavors of Princes and nations that rise up against Jehovah and His Anointed (ver. 2) will dash themselves to ruin, to an inviolable decree (חֹק), ver. 7: "Thou art my Son: I have to-day begotten Thee." Whether David (Acts iv. 25), or some other prophetic bard, be the author of this anonymous Psalm, at all events the author distinguishes himself from the Anointed One of Jehovah, and makes the latter *come forward personally* and speak in the full consciousness of his relation (ver. 7–9), just as previously do the raging insurgents (ver. 3), and the Lord enthroned in heaven, who, kindling in wrath, will thunder down upon them the voice of His indignation (ver. 6). We may not, therefore (with Hupfeld), regard the Psalm, "whether originating in some definite historical event (as perhaps a triumphant military expedition), or, (as an independent product of the general spirit of the Theocracy), as a *poetical glorification* of the Israelitish kingdom in its peculiar Theocratic character, and with all the proud hopes which the national feeling associated with it,"—and appeal in support of our view to the Lyrico-dramatic character of the Psalm. In the view of the Psalmist the several speakers have the significance of real personalities. They *express* ideas, but are not personifications of ideas.

Inasmuch, now, as the prophecy of Nathan, which was given to David before Solomon was begotten (2 Sam. xii. 24), is no fabricated declaration of God, but an actual fact of His historical revelation, and as the Anointed One in Ps. ii.

appeals to an inviolable ordinance or decree of Jehovah, we are naturally led to look back to that prophecy, and to refer the 'to-day' in its historical import to that day in which that 'seed' was promised to David, who was to stand to God in the relation of Son, and who then on that day received his procreation, or, still better, his birth (יָלַד, rarely meaning 'beget,' but generally, 'to be born') as the Son of Jehovah. This destined seed of David is the "Anointed One" of the Psalmist, and expresses the consciousness of having been in the actual course of events introduced by Jehovah into this relation. It would not be a whit more unnatural to suppose that we have here a mere personified Messianic ideal employed in celebrating its own Divine origin, than to regard the "to-day" as a mere poetic element of figurative speech, or an expression indicating the *certainty* and *reality* of the Messianic idea. But neither does the "to-day" point to the day of the coronation of an Israelitish Prince, either Solomon (Bl.) or the Maccabean Alexander Jannæus (Hitzig), appealing in these words to the Divine right of the Theocratic dominion claimed by him. It points originally to the day of the introduction of the Messiah as the Theocratic ruler from the seed of David into the knowledge and recognition of God's people through His word of revelation. From this historical connection we may understand how Paul, Acts xiii. 33, could apply this passage to the resurrection of Jesus Christ, especially if we compare Rom. i. 4, *τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν* ("*who was constituted Son of God in power*," *etc.*); and with this remember, on the one hand, that the anointing as Theocratic king presupposes the bestowment of the Holy Spirit (1 Sam. x. 6, 10; xvi. 13), and that on the influence of the Spirit of God rests the Sonship, and, on the other, that Rev. xii. conceives the issuing forth of Christ for the conquest of the kingdoms of the world, as a birth from the church in which he has his abode. From this, now, it is clear that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews is justified in citing this passage to prove a special Sonship of the Messiah such as has been attributed to no angel. This is here the specially important point with the author. To refer the "to-day" to an eternal and "metaphysical" generation of the Son on the part of God (Orig., Athan., Basil, Theoph., August., Primas., the older Lutheran Intpp. generally, Stein, Lün.), or to the day of the conception of Jesus with a reference to Luke i. 31 ff. (Chrys., Theod., Œc., Kuin., Böhm., Hofm.), or to the entrance of Jesus Christ into His kingly life of super-terrestrial glory, whether by His resurrection or by His ascension (Hil., Ambr., Calv., Grot., Schlicht., Calm., von Gerl., Del.), is partly an interpretative application, partly a deduction which the author himself, however, has not here made. [And yet, when we consider that in the application of the Psalm in question to our Lord, it applies to no event in His career so naturally as to His glorification after His resurrection, in fact applies, properly speaking, to no other period; and that Paul so applies it, Acts xiii. 33, as above noticed; and that the author, in the verse immediately preceding refers definitely to Christ's taking His seat at the right hand of God after His resurrection, as in that immediately following he refers definitely to His second coming, it seems by no means improbable that he had in his mind that definite period in which the exalted and glorified Christ was proclaimed, and, as it were, constituted Son of God in power.—K.].

VER. 6. **And when he shall again have introduced the first-born into the world, he saith.**—The usage of our Epistle does not allow us to transpose *πάλιν* and make it the introduction of a citation, as even BLEEK (recently followed by REUSS, *L'épître aux Hebr.*, p. 199 ff.) maintained after CARPZ., overlooking at the same time the correspondence of the *Aor. Subj.* with *ὅταν* to the Lat. perf. Fut. (WINER *Gr.*, 6 Ed., p. 275 ff. [HADLEY *Gr. Gr.*, 747 *a*]). The language refers to the second introduction—yet in the future—of the First-born into the world (Lün.). The *οἰκουμένη* (world) is the inhabited earth on which the Son has already previously lived and labored. As the author has already spoken of this sojourn, and, at the same time, expressly testified of the preëxistence of the Son, the mode of expression is perfectly clear and unobjectionable. Even GREG. NYSS. (*Contr. Eunom. Orat. III.*, p. 541) recognized the reference of the passage to the Second Coming, while Grot., Schlicht, Wetst., &c., refer it to a public and formal presentation of Christ after the Ascension; Bleek [Stuart] and Reuss to some otherwise unrecorded and like presentation previously to the incarnation; Chrys., Primas., Calv., Calov, Beng., to one accompanying the incarnation. The term *πρωτότοκος* is not identical in meaning with *μονογενής* (Primas., Œcum.). The latter epithet represents this as an *exclusive* relation which no being sustains to God, except the Messiah. The former specially signalizes His *preëminence* in the relations belonging essentially to the Messiah, whether to the creation (Col. i. 15) or to the Theocratic children of God (Rom. viii. 29; Col. i. 18; Rev. i. 5; Heb. ii. 10), partly in respect to the mode and time of His entrance on the stage of being, partly in respect to position, dignity and power. As the word stands here with no limiting epithet, it is to be taken without any special reference as a *terminus technicus*, founded on Psalm lxxxix. 28. To this Messianic King and Son of God, the angels, by Divine command, are to render adoring homage. Presupposing the *certainty* of the Second Coming, and referring exclusively to this, the author announces what God *then* ordains (*λέγει, he saith*). The Pres. tense brings before the eye as present that which is actually future, and springs from the conviction of its *certainty*. In the *Parousia* the author sees the final fulfilment of the prophecy, Deut. xxxii. 43, in which Jehovah, after a long withdrawal and concealment, when at length the power of the ungrateful people has utterly disappeared, revealing Himself in His compassion for their deliverance, is, at the same time, depicted as the God who brings fearful judgment on the heathen. To the words of the Heb. text, "Praise, ye heathen, His people; for He avenges the blood of His servants, and repays vengeance to His enemies, and brings expiation to His land, His people," there is subjoined in all the

MSS. of the LXX. a clause made up from Is. xliv. 33; Ps. xcvii. 7, and Ps. xxix. 1 (springing probably from the liturgical use of the Song of Moses, Del.) in which the words here cited are found strictly after the *Cod. Vat.* and the Collection of the Old Testament *Cantica* appended to the Psalter in the *Cod. Alex.* (which in the *text* of Deut. has *υἱοί* instead of *ἀγγ.*)—for that the words are here given as a citation appears undeniably from the retention of the particle *καί* ('*And*, Let all the angels, &c.'). The reference of the *αὐτῷ* to the Messiah, springs not from the fact that Jehovah Himself appears previously as the Speaker (Lün.); nor is it to be explained from the fact that Israel, who has previously been mentioned as the object of the praise of the heathen, bears elsewhere the designation of First-born, and thus what applies to Israel might, with abundant ease, be transferred to its Messianic King. It has its ground rather in the view, common to all the New Testament writers, that we are to apply to Christ as Sovereign of the Kingdom of God, all that in the Old Testament is in this relation declared of Jehovah. *Προσκυνεῖν*, with Dat. only in the later classical writers: earlier with Acc. (Bernh. *Synt.*, p. 113, 266).

Ver. 7. **And in respect to the angels, indeed, he saith.**—In contrast with the Messiah (*μέν—δέ*) the subordinate position of the angels is brought out by a declaration of God in the Scripture, in a twofold relation: 1, in that they are *servants;* 2, in that they are *changeable* and *perishable* (Lün.). Πρός, *in reference, in relation to;* so frequently (Win. *Gram.*, § 49 *h.* [It is one of the most familiar usages of *πρός* with the Acc.; see *Dem.* 1 *Ol.* 4.—K.]. The connection in Ps. civ. 4 seems to warrant our understanding it as affirming that *winds* and *lightnings*, like nature in general, are merely servants of God. As, however, עֹשֶׂה with double Acc. usually signifies not *making into something* (עָשָׂה לְ), but, *making out of something*, it were properly translated, "making His messengers out of winds, and His servants out of flaming fire." Still we can hardly suppose that the Psalmist meant in this to express the idea that "God, in accomplishing the work which is wrought in the world through angelic agencies, gives to the angels the elemental wind and fire as the material in which they are, as it were, to embody themselves and assume a visible form," Del.). It can, however, also be translated: "making winds out of His messengers, and flaming fire out of His ministers." This reading is adopted in the Sept., which, by placing the Art. before *ἀγγέλ.* and *λειτ.*, shows that it thus regards the angels; and our author, who, perhaps, with reference to Ex. iii. 2, writes *πυρὸς φλόγα*, instead of the *πῦρ φλέγον* of the Sept. (the *πυρὸς φλόγα* of the *Cod. Alex.* is probably a later correction from our Epistle), evidently regards the passage as teaching that the angels have so little of *substantive* existence that they are obliged sometimes to clothe themselves in the changing garment of natural phenomena for the execution of the Divine commands, and, under the form of elemental agencies, to act with dynamical efficiency. Substantially parallel are Ps. xxxiv. 8; John v. 4. Also the Rabbins call the angels כחות=*δυνάμεις*, and the Targum at Ps. civ. 4 paraphrases "who maketh His messengers swift as winds, His ministers strong as flaming fire."

Ver. 8. **But in respect to the Son,** *etc.*—The Son is not directly addressed (Bengel), but the *πρός* is to be taken as in the verse preceding. And as matter of fact the words, Ps. xlv. 7, are not spoken to the Messiah, but were simply at an early period, as shown by the admission of the Psalm into the temple liturgy (לַמְנַצֵּחַ), referred to Him. The Psalm designated in the inscription as a song of love, and celebrating the marriage of Solomon or Joram with a foreign princess, is presented by an Israelite to the king (ver. 2), who is addressed in vv. 3-10, while in v. 11 ff. the discourse changes to the bride. The minstrel conceives the king, in his Theocratic position and function, as commissioner and vicegerent of Jehovah, who, by righteous and wise government, is to effect the destined coming of the Kingdom of God. Inasmuch as by the king in question this was but partially or not at all effected, the Psalm early past over as a mystical bridal song, to the marriage of the Messiah with His Church. The Messianic references also appear in the Psalm itself, in that it is said (ver. 7) that His throne is Elohim=Divine forever and ever, or better, that His Divine throne is forever and ever: [or, better still, I think, even in the original Heb.: "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." This is certainly the most natural construction of the sentence, and need not be shrunk from, as it is in perfect keeping with the context; and as, at all events, *the idea* is substantially contained in the context—K.]; in that it is said further that God (ver. 17) will render His posterity princes over the whole earth, so that they should eclipse the splendor of their ancestors, and all nations should praise the King on account of His glory (ver. 18); and finally, in that some characteristic expressions of this Psalm are used in Is. ix. 5; lxi. 8, directly of the Messiah as the Servant of Jehovah—a fact the more important, as אֵל גִּבּוֹר, *mighty God*, is elsewhere a customary designation of God Himself, *e. g.*, Deut. x. 17; Jer. xxxii. 18; Neh. ix. 32; Ps. xxiv. 8. Since, therefore, the Theocratic King "sat on the throne of Jehovah" (1 Chron. xxix. 23)—and the throne of God is eternal, Lam. v. 19,—and Zech. prophesies (xii. 8) that the house of David shall yet be at the head of the nation, as *Elohim*, as *a messenger of Jehovah* (כֵּאלֹהִים כְּמַלְאַךְ יְהוָֹה), the author of our Epistle is entirely justified in interpreting the Psalm not as typically or indirectly, but as prophetically and directly Messianic, and in finding a proof of the Godhead of the Messiah in the fact that He who as King was, for His love of righteousness, exalted above all His fellows, received the appellation of *Elohim.* For while, indeed, the Kingly government, as representative of God ruling in majesty, is sometimes named Elohim (Ex. xxi. 6; xxii. 7; Ps. lxxxii.) the *individual person* never elsewhere receives this name. And he would all

the more naturally infer the Godhead of the Messiah, inasmuch as love of righteousness and hatred of iniquity are special characteristics of the holiness of God, Ps. v. 5; Is. lxi. 8. Διὰ τοῦτο many erroneously explain (with August. and Thom. Aquin.) of the *purpose* and *result* of the anointing, referring it to the anointing of the Holy Spirit made *in order that* the anointed one *might* love righteousness. In the Heb. text it is a *quality of the King* that He *loves* righteousness; and this forms the ground for that fulness of joy which, as an anointing, has been poured over Him in richer measure than over His companions or fellows, *i. e.*, the other kings of the earth. As this love of righteousness is to be conceived not as a state of passive repose, but as an *active* attribute, the Sept. employs the Aor. ἠγάπησας, ἐμίσησας (didst love, *etc.*), and from this it is still more clear that διὰ τοῦτο points back to this as the ground of the anointing, which also our author understands not of the crowning of Jesus, after His accomplished earthly career, as Heavenly King, and His exaltation thus above the angelic dwellers in heaven (Peirce, Olsh., Bl., Ebr., Alf., Lün.), but, in accordance with the original text, of the fulness of bliss which He, long since anointed as King of the Kingdom of God, has above His fellows. 'Fellows' Klee erroneously refers to "all creatures;" Chrys., Theoph., Œc., Beng., to "all men." The 'fellows' (μέτοχοι) of the Messiah must certainly be *anointed* ones. Thus they are either Christians (Theodor., Calv., Camero, Schlicht.), or the prophets, high-priests and kings, anointed as types of Christ (Wittich, Braun, Cranm.), or, which seems best suited to the connection, *Princes* in general (Kuin., Ebr., Del.). The author does not develop the individual features of the passage in their possible application, but lays the whole emphasis on the repeatedly recurring term, "God," which, in an equally exclusive manner with the term "Son," is given in the Divine word of Scripture to the Messiah.

VER. 10. **And: Thou, Lord, in the beginning didst lay,** *etc.*—The καί introduces in the closest connection of thought with the preceding, a citation from Ps. cii. 26–28 illustrating the point that all aid to the people of God must come, not through any creature instrumentality, but through God the Creator. The Psalm is a lamentation, written at a late period of the exile, in which the poet, profoundly penetrated by the wretchedness of his people, expects and entreats deliverance and preservation from God, who, as the eternal one, even amidst that change and revolution of things over which He presides, still approves Himself as unchangeably the same, as הוּא, αὐτός. The Psalmist is hence so sure of deliverance that he declares that it "will be told to coming generations," how God looked down from heaven, and heard the groaning of the captives (ver. 19 ff.). In the fact that help comes only from the eternal and unchangeable God, while even the heavens, as they were originally formed by Him, are also transformed by Him, lies our author's warrant for referring the cited words to the Son by whom God hath made the worlds. The author is not merely expressing in scriptural phraseology what, in his own belief, and, in the presumed belief of his readers, *may be justly said* of Jesus (HOFM., *Schriftb.*, I. 150). There would then be wanting the connecting link which, according to the tenor of Scripture, warrants his statement. We are not at liberty to transfer to the Son *all* the attributes ascribed to the Father. Hence we do not say with THEOD. of Mops. (ed. *Fritzsche*, p. 162) that the Old Test. Scripture when it speaks of God, always speaks of the Father without exclusion of the Son. Equally unsatisfactory is the explanation that the interpolated κύριε of the Sept. (wanting in the Heb.) has, as being the customary designation of Jesus in apostolic times, seduced the author into his interpretation (Böhm., Lün.); for ch. viii. 8 ff.; xii. 6 ff. forbid our charging the author with any such ignorance. The link of connection is found rather (as in all the other citations), in the fact that *the original Psalm* itself expressed a positive hope in that earnestly longed for revelation of the salvation of Jehovah which was to be accomplished *only in the Messiah.* (Similarly HOFM., "*Prophecy and Fulfilment,*" II. p. 83, Del.). Κατ' ἀρχάς, Ps. cxix., clii. is not=ἐν ἀρχῇ, but corresponds to ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, and expresses also in the classics extension downwards in time (KÜHN., § 605, 1. JELF, II. § 629, 2). In Heb. we have the more general לְפָנִים=*formerly.* Διαμένειν indicates the *abiding* in one condition through all the vicissitudes of time, Ps. cxix. 90; 2 Pet. iii. 4. περιβόλαιον denotes anything *thrown around* (1 Cor. xii. 15, probably a veil), commonly the garment thrown around like a mantle. Storr finds in ἀλλαγήσονται the idea that the heavens, which are works of God's hands or fingers (Ps. viii. 4), will be exchanged like a garment, in that God will make a new heaven and a new earth. This form of conception is certainly made prominent Is. lxv. 17; lxvi. 22; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Rev. xxi. 1; for the Scripture, while indeed it teaches a τέλος of the world, Matt. xxiv. 14, a change of its present σχῆμα, 1 Cor. vii. 31, a passing away of heaven and earth, Matt. v. 18; Luke xxi. 33; 1 John ii. 17; Rev. xx. 11, a dissolving of the elements, 2 Pet. iii. 12, yet by no means teaches an *annihilation of its existence*, but rather a *regeneration*, a new birth of the world, with the *transformation* naturally attending it. Yet *here* the other form of conception seems the preponderating one, which makes heaven an apparent *tent-cloth* spread out over the earth, Is. xl. 22; Ps. civ. 2, without, however, requiring us with Heinrichs to resolve the ἔργα into the products of the loom. Here their transformation consists in their becoming antiquated, Ps. cii. 27. The reading ἑλίξεις, then, involves the thought that they are rolled up, and laid aside. This rolling up, Is. xxxiv. 4; Rev. vi. 14, is compared with that of a book; and Is. xxxiv. 4 it is said of the heavenly hosts that they fall off as the leaves of the vine, and as the withering of the fig-tree; while in like manner in Is. li. 6 they are said to pass away like *smoke*. But the Lord is unchangeable in His being, and absolutely imperishable. In the Hebrew we have: "And Thy years have no completion," *i. e.*, their end never comes. In the Greek: "Thy years shall never fail," *i. e.*, they shall never cease or discontinue. 'Εκλείπειν is used as intransitive also in the classics.

VER. 13. **Sit on my right hand**, *etc.*—Εἶπε (ver. 5) used of the declaration made *absolutely, and once for all*, (*he said*), and λέγει (ver. 6) of the declaration which is *now* or continuously being made (*he saith, he is saying*), are here exchanged for εἴρηκε of the declaration *which stands before us as fixed* in Scripture (*he hath said*). Del.

The metabatic δέ which stands in the third place after a preposition with its case (HARTUNG, *Partikellehre* I. p. 190) introduces as the last proof—challenging in its *interrogative* form the assured assent of the reader—the elevation of the Messiah to a joint sovereignty with God in absolute triumph over His foes, in contrast with angels who, though spiritual beings, have but the place and destination of *servants*. True, the angels, as inhabitants of heaven, also enjoy the immediate presence of God, and the proverbial expressions, "he is good as an angel of God," 1 Sam. xxix. 9; "he judges righteously as an angel of God," 2 Sam. xiv. 17; "he is wise as an angel of God," 2 Sam. xiv. 20; xix. 27, point to their extraordinary intellectual and moral endowments. But organized as an heavenly host, 1 K. xxii. 19; 2 Chron. xviii. 18,—whence we are told of an encampment of angels (Gen. xxxii. 1, 2), and find chariots and horses assigned to them (2 K. vi. 17),—they encompass the throne of Jehovah—partly in the form of an advisory assemblage (Job i. 6; ii. 1; Ps. lxxxix. 8); partly praising God and His works in holy joy, Ps. xxix. 1; ciii. 20; partly as servants standing ready to execute His commands, Job iv. 18; xv. 15, as heroes of strength, Ps. ciii. 20; cxlviii. 2, and as Jehovah's (Jos. v. 14) "host of the high ones," Is. xxiv. 21. But to the Messiah is ascribed not merely sitting *beside* or *in presence* of the all-ruling God, but sitting *at His right hand*. The *former* expression would have designated Him only as theocratic ruler; as David, after the removal of the ark of the covenant to Mount Zion, had his throne in immediate proximity to the throne of Jehovah. But the *latter* elevates Him above every species of principality and dominion to participation in the divine majesty itself. The historical incidents in which this typical Psalm had birth, stand connected apparently (ver. 5 ff.) with the victory of David over the Syrians and Ammonites. But the promise of the elevation spoken of (ver. 1) appears as an *oracular* or *prophetic* utterance (נְאֻם) of Jehovah, whose fulfilment is still in the future (ver. 4), and is directed to the Lord of the minstrel (אֲדֹנִי, *my Lord*); we are, therefore, entirely justified in assuming a widening of the prophetic view beyond the historical and typical incidents, and in finding in the "Lord" not the David sung by the people (Ewald), but the Messiah whom David recognized as at once his Lord and his Son (Matt. xxii. 41 ff.); especially as this king, whom the people, born like dew from the womb of the morning, clad in sacred garments, are to follow into the conflict (ver. 3), is not merely to conquer His enemies upon the whole earth (ver. 6), but as priestly king (ver. 4), is to stand in a relation (to be hereafter more fully considered), such as could be predicated of no historical ruler of Israel. The custom of setting the foot on the neck of a conquered enemy, belongs to earlier Israel, Josh. x. 24; 1 K. v. 17. To later Greek belongs ὑποπόδιον, and the frequent Hellenistic formula ἐκ δεξιῶν which implies the rising conspicuously above that which is on the right hand.

VER. 14. **Are they not all ministering spirits**, *etc.*—In this summing up of the series of thoughts developed from ver. 4, the emphasis lies partly on πάντες, *all*, which includes even the angelic *leaders*, partly on λειτουργικά, which designates these spirits as standing in sacred service. For the term points, not in a general way, to service obligatory by virtue of public office, but specially to that connected with the public Levitical worship, Ex. xxxi. 10; Num. iv. 12, vii. 5; 2 Chron. xxiv. 14. Hence also the Rabbins frequently designate certain angels as מַלְאֲכֵי הַשָּׁרֵת. No allusion to the *heavenly sanctuary* can be inferred from the choice of the expression: it simply refers back to v. 7. The Pres. Part. ἀποστελλόμενα *habitually sent forth, commissioned*, brings out the proper characteristic of the angels, or that *habitus*, that *habitual* form of action, which springs from their nature, and corresponds to their destination. The term διακονία refers not *directly* to their rendering service to men; (for, apart from the fact that the angels are not placed in subordination to men, the construction would require the Dat. τοῖς μέλλουσι (Acts xi. 29; 1 Cor. xvi. 15), but to the ministerial relation in which they stand to *God*, and in which *God employs* them for the good of those who are to inherit the salvation procured by His Son. This special signification of σωτηρία (though without the article) is implied alike in the context, and in the verb κληρονομεῖν, *inherit*. It implies neither deliverance from danger in general (Michael., Schleusn., Böhm., Kuin.); nor again the *actual conferring* of eternal salvation upon its inheritors through the ministrations assigned by God to the angels (Lün.); but simply *the proper office* of the angels, as those whom God sends forth for the benefit of godly men. The term σωτηρία, employed in designating this salvation, presupposes a deliverance from ruin wrought by "the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." Tit. ii. 13.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. God has not merely communicated His word to the prophets in the manifold forms of His revelations of Himself: nor has He merely *in* the prophets and by their mouth spoken formerly to the fathers. He also speaks to us in *Holy Scripture*. The development of the precise doctrine of inspiration is yet a problem for theology; but the church has to confess that in the Holy Scripture she hears God Himself speak, and that she feels herself bound, in all that respects *salvation*, to adhere implicitly to *the Word of God* as uttered in the Scripture.

2. The old canon of Scripture interpretation: *Novum Testamentum in vetere latet; Vetus Testamentum in novo patet*, springs from a correct apprehension of the true essential relation of the two parts of the economy of salvation. The sacred writers constantly emphasize the *divine purpose*, as that which determines the events of history; yet this

not formally as *mere* purpose, which might seek its end irrespective of the course of things; but as that *divine determination*, which of itself, in a concrete manner, brings about its result. When this determination is prophetically uttered, this prophetic word is an expression of the divine counsel, thought and will, which is already stamped with the impress of human history, but primarily as but a *form*, which awaits in the future its ultimate fulfilment, and reaches this by an actual *carrying out in history* of the divine purpose. The historical facts which gradually lead to this final and proper fulfilment of prophecy, bear, for this reason, a *typico-prophetic* character. They represent typically, and for precisely this reason, but partially and defectively, the idea that is to be realized; yet they must be regarded as evidences of its truth, and of its infallible and already incipient realization. They are interwoven with historical conditions which as yet contain no adequate realization of the divine thought. It might hence be half suspected that nothing but the caprice or the unwarranted fancies of a later time had discovered this relation of purely historical facts, or of earlier oracular utterances, to those later events which they typify and predict. Unquestionably, too, we are warranted in *insisting* on the *historical foundations* of prophecy, and on its *direct* reference to immediate events, as against an unhistorical and, as it were, *soothsaying* prophecy. But the *exaggeration* of this feature leads to a mode of dealing with events which knows *no prophecy*, to a history with no positive divine guidance and control, with no real ideas, with no true future of redemption. The New Testament writers, on the other hand, see bursting through these enveloping folds of history the germs and tendencies of divine ideas, and, in their illustrative citations, mainly exhibit the symbolical facts, in a *direct* and *immediate application* to the fulfilment already effected through Christ. Hence they, on the one hand, neither take the facts and statements of the Old Testament, in their original import as referring to immediate events, nor on the other, put upon them an allegorical and mystical interpretation, which rests upon no sure basis; but so interpret them that they appear as members of that system of divine ideas and acts, by which, in the progress of revelation, the original Gospel which announced "the seed of the woman," is gradually, step by step, announcing and accomplishing itself until its final and complete fulfilment in the coming of the Son of God in the flesh. The occasional use of Rabbinical forms of citation and modes of interpretation in no way destroys this essential relation, but stands connected with the national position and special culture of the respective writers: compare (from earlier times) ANDR. KESLER *de dictorum V. T. in N. allegatione* 1627; also in HACKSPAN *disp. theol. et phil. syllogæ*, p. 563 sq.: *Oporinus, demonstratio N. T. ex. V. T.* p. 60 sq., and SURENHUSIUS, Βίβλος καταλλαγῆς, *in quo, secundum veterum theol. Hebr. formulas allegandi et modos interpretandi, conciliantur loca V. in N. T. allegata*, Amst. 1713.

3. *The true and perfect deity of Jesus Christ* is to be proved *a.* from the *name* "Son of God," bestowed on Him in an exclusive sense, and as designating a specific relation, which, along with *essential unity*, points to a hypostatical distinction of persons, for which reason He is also directly called "God:" *b.* from His *works* of creating, upholding, redeeming, governing, and renovating the world: *c.* from the *perfection* of the metaphysical, intellectual and moral *attributes* involved in that specific relation to God, and attesting themselves in all these several spheres of action: *d.* from the *adoring worship* which belongs to Him, and is rendered Him even by the *Princes* among the heavenly angels, a fact which, within the sphere of the monotheistic faith, is of the utmost significance.

4. The doctrine of the *eternity* of the world is equally to be repudiated with that of its future *annihilation*. Its *transformation* into a new and nobler form of existence is effected by means of the same Lord through whom it was created, and that according to divine purpose and will, so that its destruction also is to be referred to no exhaustion of originally supplied powers, wrought by age and the natural decay of years, nor to any regularly recurring cycles of revolution, by which, at definite intervals and according to unchangeable laws, creation is resolved into its elements, and again remoulded into new forms and combinations for other destinies.

5. The anticipated *reintroduction* of the First-born into the inhabited world forms the *goal* of the ways of God in history, and promises a *revelation of glory* to which, in hope and faith, we are *to look;* which, in the patience of the saints, we are humbly *to await*, and for which, in the sanctification of our persons, as children of God born anew to be brethren in Jesus Christ, and called to be fellow-heirs with Him, we are earnestly to *prepare*, that we may join the adoring worship of the angels.

6. The invocation of angels, as ministers to our need and mediators of salvation, is no less irrational and absurd, than the denial of their existence and of their employment in the service of God for the benefit of the heirs of salvation, is unscriptural. The *position* here assigned to them excludes any rendering to them of *worship*, and, on the other hand, their *spiritual nature* remits to the province of imagination and art all sensible representations of their *form;* while yet their employment in the service of God renders possible their transient *appearance and agency* on earth in the most various forms.

7. The *means* which God employs for the protection and support of the pious in this wicked world, are numerous in proportion as He is unfathomable in wisdom, unlimited in power, and inexhaustible in love. Besides the forces, creatures, and instrumentalities, which belong to the sphere of *earth* and *human* action, He has equally at command, for the exigencies of even our temporal life, *heavenly and angelic agencies*, and that in unmeasured abundance and untold variety.

8. The establishment of *the Kingdom of God on earth* in the form of a kingdom of grace under the regal dominion of the Messiah, who, after accomplishing the mission assigned to Him below, is now forever exalted above all powers to the throne of God, is, on the one hand, a fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies; on the other,

a preparation for the consummated dominion of God over all the world, and itself again a prophecy of the kingdom of glory. The CHRISTOCRACY *is the fully unfolded, world-embracing form of the* THEOCRACY; and in His consummated glory the *Exalted* One becomes, for all eternity, the medium of that communion with God which, as the *Humiliated* One, He originally procured. "The language, 'Sit at my right hand,' means, in a word: exalted highly and placed as glorious King—not over the towers of Jerusalem, nor over the empire of Babylon, Rome, Constantinople, or the entire earth—which were indeed a great power;—nay, not over heaven, stars, and all that our eyes can behold, but exalted to a power far higher and wider. Seat thyself—such is His language—beside me on the lofty seat where I sit, and be equal to me.' For by sitting beside Him, he means not, sitting at His *feet*, but at His right hand, in the same majesty and power with Himself, which is nothing less than a Divine power" (Luth. at Ps. cx.).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The consolation of the Church of God in troublous times is: 1, God's words of encouragement in the Holy Scripture; 2, the Government of Jesus Christ on the throne of God; 3, the inheritance of blessedness to which it is destined.—The right which Jesus Christ has to us as, *a.* our Creator; *b.* our Saviour; *c.* our Ruler.—The worship which we owe to Jesus Christ: 1, on the ground of the Divine command in the Holy Scriptures; 2, after the example of the heavenly spirits; 3, as citizens of the Kingdom of God.—What summons us Christians ceaselessly to living gratitude to God? 1, the destination to bliss, which God's word vouchsafes to us; 2, the protection which He bestows upon us by powers and servants sent forth from heaven; 3, the gracious aid which He renders to us in the Church of His Son.—The dominion which Jesus Christ exercises: 1, in its character, *a.* as a Divine dominion; *b.* for the conquest of the world; *c.* by employing the powers and resources of the heavenly realm; 2, in its establishment by His peculiar relation, *a.* to God, as Son; *b.* to the world, as Lord of all things; *c.* to the Church, as Saviour.—The high dignity which we Christians have: 1, as children of God, who are ransomed from the perishable nature of this world; 2, as brethren of Christ, who, as First-born, sits upon the throne of God; 3, as heirs of blessedness, for whose good angels are sent forth in the service of God.

VON BOGATZKY:—As God has anointed Christ for His threefold office, so are we also anointed by Christ with His Spirit: 1, that as priests of God, we may offer up ourselves, and pray for one another; 2, that as kings, we may conquer all our enemies; 3, that in the fellowship of the prophetic office of Christ we may teach and admonish one another.—LAURENTIUS:—Eternal life is an inheritance, and is thus not obtained by works.—If the holy angels minister to believers, how shall not one believer much more minister to his fellow?—HILLER:—The Church with which the Lord would betroth Himself in faith, had, in the word, the *plighted vow* of His eternal love and truth; in His Spirit the *bridal pledge*, and in the shadowy rites, the *image* and *portrait* of its King.—The Sacred Scripture is God's *testimony* of His Son, *a.* who will come into the world; *b.* who *has* come into the world; *c.* to *bless and save* sinners.—This testimony of Scripture must be *believed*, *a.* because it is a testimony; *b.* because it is God's testimony; *c.* because it is such a testimony of the Son of God.

RIEGER:—The more righteously a kingdom is administered, the greater is its *permanency*.—He whose heart God inclines to *righteousness*, and whom He inspires with a disposition *to hate unrighteousness*, even though it may find a lurking place, as it will, in his own members, is by the one rendered fit for *the inheritance of God's Kingdom*, and by the latter gains enlarged space for the Spirit and its glad anointing.—As from the *beginning of the ways* of God in the creation, so also from the *goal and end* in which all will issue in the ultimate deliverance and renewal of the creation, we can derive much that appertains to *the glory of the Son of God*.

STARKE:—As we mortals have a changeful nature, not only material, but immaterial, which latter, in the waste and repair of sense, must experience daily an ever increasing change, we should strive all the more industriously after the true unchangeableness which Christ has brought to light by His Gospel, 2 Tim. i. 10.—God changes neither in His being nor in His words; hence we can securely commit ourselves to Him.—Christ, the Son of Man, is truly exalted upon the throne of God. If thou wilt not believe this, thou wilt hereafter see and experience it to thine eternal sorrow, Ps. ii. 12.—Are the holy angels servants whom God sends out for our service? How, then, should we stand in fear of them, thank God for their protection, and in genuine holiness of heart render ourselves worthy of it?—High honor of believers that they are ministered to by Thrones, Principalities and Powers! Praise God; grieve not the angels; lead an angelic life, and thou wilt be borne by the angels where thou wishest eternally to be, Luke xv. 10; xx. 36.

SPENER:—From the Sonship of God and regeneration comes all the blessedness which we receive as an inheritance, Rom. viii. 16; Gal. iv. 7; Acts xx. 32; xxvi. 18.

HEUBNER:—Christ is the most blessed King. The earthly prosperity of worldly rulers bears no comparison with the heavenly delight which Christ, as the exalted Son of God, enjoys. He enjoys the bliss of being in most intimate communion with God, and of being loved and adored by hosts of ransomed souls, by all spirits.—The whole spirit world is a realm of servants of God. A ruler without subjects possesses no kingdom.—The pious are *protegés* of heaven, of the angels. Both are one under Christ.

STIER:—Where remain the thrones of all kings on earth amidst the revolution of things, at the end of the days? They are swept away and removed; but the Divine throne of the One Anointed above all anointed ones continues and stands unto eternity. Where in the hands of sinful men is there a sceptre of sovereignty whose honor has not been in some way stained with unrighteousness and error? But the

gracious and peaceful sceptre of the One Righteous and Blessed is truly a sceptre of rectitude. —The Son *rules* on the eternal throne of God, Himself God and Lord: the spirits and personal powers of heaven *serve* as creatures. The Son has taken His seat in the reassumption of His original Divine power; the angels are sent forth from His and the Father's seat. They are those who perform *priestly ministration* in all their allotted activity and service. He is and *remains without end* of years, the Lord whom they *adoringly* serve.

[OWEN:—"Whatever our changes may be, inward or outward, yet Christ, changing not, our eternal condition is secured, and relief provided against all present troubles and miseries. The immutability and eternity of Christ are the spring of our consolation and security in every condition. Such is the frailty of the nature of man, and such the perishing condition of all created things, that none can ever obtain the least stable consolation but what ariseth from an interest in the omnipotency, sovereignty, and eternity of Jesus Christ"].

III.

Warning exhortation to give heed to the revelation that has been brought to us through so extraordinary a mediation.

CHAPTER II. 1–4.

Therefore [For this reason, *διὰ τοῦτο*] we ought[1] [it is necessary, *δεῖ*] to give the more
earnest heed to the things which we have heard [to the things which were heard, *τοῖς*
ἀκουσθεῖσι], lest at any time [lest haply, lest perchance, *μήποτε*] we let *them* slip [flow
2 by or drift away from them]. For if the word spoken by [through, *διά*] angels was
[became, proved, *ἐγένετο*] steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received
3 a just recompense of reward; How shall we escape, if we neglect [after neglecting,
ἀμελήσαντες] so great [a] salvation; which at the first began to be [was originally] spo-
ken by [through, *διά*] the Lord, and was confirmed unto [for] us by them that heard
4 *him;* God also [jointly] bearing *them* witness, both with signs and wonders, and with
divers miracles [acts of power, *δυνάμεις*], and gifts [distributions] of the Holy Ghost,
according to his own [his *αὐτοῦ*] will?

[1] Ver. 1.—[*δεῖ*, not moral necessity, *we ought;* but logical, *we must, it is* necessary.—*τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν*, historically, *to the things which were heard* when God *ἐλάλησεν spoke* in his Son.—*μήποτε* not, *lest at any time* (as Moll: *nicht jemals*), but, *lest perchance, lest haply* as ch. iv. 1; Matth. iv. 6, vi. 25. So Del. and De Wette, *nicht etwa;* so Alf. and Bib. Un. *haply*. Wordsworth both here and ch. iv. 1 neglects it in his rendering.—*παραῤῥυῶμεν* 2 Aor. Subj. Pass. might be rendered figuratively *to slip away from*, but not possibly "to *let slip*, as if causative. Here better *to flow by*, or, *aside from, to drift by*, or, *away from*. Alf.: "*to flow past or aside,*" "deflect from a course," and hence "*be diverted.*" Moll, with many others, *vorbeigeströmt werden, to be drifted* or *swept by*.

Ver. 2.—*διὰ ἀγγέλων* not *by angels* as agents as if *ὑπὸ ἀγγ.;* but *through, by means of angels*, as instruments (*διά*).—*ἐγένετο, became proved itself;* not *was*, as Eng. Ver.

Ver. 3.—So also *διὰ κυρίου, through the Lord*, God the Father being conceived as the supreme agent.—*διὰ τῶν ἀκουσάντων, through them that heard him*, with still the idea of intermediate agency.—*αὐτοῦ, his*, not the reflexive *αὐτοῦ*—*ἑαυτοῦ, his own, viz., will* (*θέλησιν*).—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 1. For this reason it is necessary.—For the term *Gospel* (*εὐαγγέλιον*) our author employs here, after the periphrastic style of Luke (who employs the term *εὐαγγέλιον* only Acts xv. 7; xx. 24), the term *τὰ ἀκουσθέντα, the things which were heard*, as referring not so immediately to the subject-matter of the Gospel, as to that special form of announcement which stands distinguished above all other methods of revelation. The Gospel would demand and deserve attention in whatever manner it might have found utterance in words, and addressed itself to our ears. The transcendent preëminence, however, of the mode of its historical introduction, creates a necessity lying in the very nature of the case, and whose observance is imperatively binding upon us, to direct and yield up to it our persons, Acts xvi. 14 (*προσέχειν ἡμᾶς*, with a correspondingly heightened devotion (*περισσοτέρως*), frequent with Paul, and not, as affirmed by Bleek, unknown to the classics, but found [Del.] DIOD. SIC. XIII. p. 108; ATHEN., V., p. 192 f.). For the *διὰ τοῦτο, on this account*, so points back to the preceding exhibition of the glory of the Mediator of the New Testament revelation, as to furnish a basis for that warning admonition to fidelity of faith, to which the author's anxiety for his readers leads him at this early stage of the Epistle. If the required heed and devotion are withheld, then must follow the fearful consequences, which, as shown by the *μήποτε*, the

author would fain avert from his readers.—*lest we be swept, or drift by* (παραῤῥυῶμεν, Lachm., Tisch., is 2 Aor. Subj. Pass.). Drift by *what?* Not by the sure harbor of eternal blessedness—which were only properly a consequence—but by *that which is heard.* Here again, however, it is not to be understood of *forgetting the mere words,* which would be a meaning quite inadequate to the gravity of the passage; nor of drifting by the salvation contained in the Gospel, which is correct, indeed, as to the substance of the thought, but overlooks the specific demands of the context. It is rather that *firm hold* or *holding-point,* proffered in the Gospel, and which conditions our attainment of salvation. This those lose who do not yield themselves up personally to that which is brought to their hearing, and are then carried away from the Gospel, and as it were swept by the salvation which is in it not merely announced, but actually held out and communicated to believers, and are thus without stay or anchor, borne on by the stream, "as a ship before her landing shoots away into destruction." (*Gloss* of LUTHER).

VER. 2. **For if the word which was spoken through angels.**—The supposition, which the author shares with his readers, and which he makes the basis of his reasoning, *a minori ad majus,* is the two-fold one, 1. that the Mosaic law is a word established by Divine authority, and which hence is not only obligatory, but also in earlier history vindicated its validity against every objective transgression (παράβασις), and subjective neglect (παρακοή, *refusal to hear*), by corresponding retribution; 2. that it was given through the intervention not of the Divine Messiah or Son, but only of angels. This angelic agency, however, finds no mention at Ex. xix. in connection with the legislation of Sinai, and also at Hebr. ii. 19, only a Divine φωνὴ ῥημάτων, *voice of words* is mentioned in distinction from the accompanying natural phenomena. For this reason Dorsch, Calov, Schöttgen, Carpzov and Semler, have referred the passage to such revelations as Gen. xix. 26, in which angelic agency is actually mentioned, exclusively of the law; while again D. Heinsius and G. Olearius, seeing that λόγος here must refer to the Mosaic law, have regarded the ἄγγελοι as referring to *human* messengers. But for the existence of the belief that the law of God was given to Moses by the mediation of angels, we have as testimonies JOSEPH. *Antiq. Jud.*, XV., 5, 3, and CARMINA SAMARIT., *Ed. Gesen.* III. 8; IV—8, 11, and particularly Acts vii. 53, and Gal. iii. 19. The tradition itself seems to have its biblical origin in the obscure words of the Song of Moses, Deut. xxxiii. 2: "And thou from holy multitudes," scil. didst come forth, where the LXX. make express mention of angels; as also in Psalm lxviii. composed in the time of Solomon, in which at ver. 18 the entrance of Jehovah into Zion in the midst of the myriad chariots of His angels, is compared to His descent upon Sinai. We must guard, however, against restricting this angelic agency to the Angel of the covenant, who acted as Mediator of the most distinguished revelations of God in the Old Testament; for here the word is plural (δι' ἀγγέλων). The classical ἔνδικος is found elsewhere in the New Testament only at Rom. iii. 8. For the simple μισθός *wages,* or the classical μισθοδοσία, *giving of wages,* stands here the more full-sounding [indeed more intrinsically emphatic] form μισθαποδοσία *rendering, or paying of wages;* here the term is used in a bad sense, while at ch. x. 35; xi. 26, the requital is not that of punishment, but of approving reward.

VER. 3. **How shall we escape—salvation?**—The future ἐκφευξόμεθα stands in reference to the final judgment: we need not, however, (with Heinrichs, Steng., Ebr.) supply anything from v. 2; but simply take the expression as at ch. xii. 25; 1 Thess. v. 3, technically and absolutely. The Aor. Part. ἀμελήσαντες specifies the act which must have preceded and determined the impossibility of escape. This utter and complete impossibility (πῶς) of escape lies in the fact that precisely we (ἡμεῖς), who live in the time of salvation, have to do with a salvation of such transcendent excellence (τηλικαύτης σωτηρίας)=*talis tantæque salutis,* as that now under consideration.

Which being originally spoken through the Lord, *etc.*—The clause commencing with ἥτις (*quippe quæ*) is not designed to show that which grows out of the nature of "so great a salvation," (Thol.); nor to exhibit the greatness of this salvation in the exalted character of its Mediator (Del.); but to illustrate the sentiment of the entire passage. The contrast between the mediation accomplished by the Lord, and that effected by angels, forms but a part of the Gospel claim to attention. A second contrast is found in the fact that it is not merely commands (Theod. Mops., Lün., Del.)—we must add that it is not merely promises—which constitute the subject matter of the announcement, but salvation itself. Still we are not therefore authorized in saying (Ebr.) that the law was barely a word: the Gospel, on the contrary, is a deliverance, a redemption, an act. The emphasis lies here, not as at Titus ii. 11, on the fact that "the grace of God which bringeth salvation" has been manifested in the world, but that the *salvation,* after having had its proclamation commenced and inaugurated by the intervention of the Lord the *Saviour* Himself, has, through immediate ear-witnesses, taking a sure place in history, been transmitted to us.

The link between σωτηρία, *salvation,* and the βεβαιωθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς, *established for us,* is found in the *Word* of Salvation (Acts xiii. 26, ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης), whose historical carrying forward and perpetuation was no less marvellous than its origin. Lünemann declines here to find a contrast between a more remote and a more immediate Word of God, on the ground that God himself is the ultimate and supreme author, as well of the Mosaic law as of the Gospel, and that the latter, as having originated διὰ τοῦ κυρίου is, in like manner, an intermediate one; while Ebrard and Delitzsch maintain such a contrast on the ground of the divine nature and equality of the Son. Both are equally wide of the mark. For while διὰ τοῦ κυρίου stands indeed parallel to δι' ἀγγέλων, the relation of intermediateness expressed equally in both cases by διά, refers in this context not to the *intrinsic relation of God Himself* to men in His revelation, as being more direct through the Son, more indirect through angels, but con-

trasts the *historical beginnings* of the two Testaments, as being inaugurated the one through angels, and the other through the Lord Himself. The author's eye is directed not to the transcendental, but to the *historical* mediation, as shown by the participial clause ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου, which also is no mere objective apposition to ἐβεβαιώθη (Ebr.)—as if the province of the ear-witnesses was to vouch to later readers for the fact that the Gospel had come from the Lord Himself—but declares rather how the σωτηρία has become matter of evangelical *proclamation*, in which form it has had, through the ministry of those who heard it, its sure transmission to us.

VER. 4. **God also jointly bearing them witness,** *etc.*—The "confirmation" (βεβαίωσις) implied in the verb is all the more decisive and absolute from the fact that to the testimony of the Apostolic word is added the accompanying and authenticating testimony of God, John v. 31; Mark xvi. 20. This testimony comes in acts which, as *tokens* of an invisible and spiritual agency, are called σημεῖα, *signs;* as elevated above ordinary and natural laws, and thus exciting wonder and astonishment, τέρατα, *prodigies, wonders.* Their close connection, expressed by τε καί, *both, and,* corresponds to the Hebrew אותות ומופתים. Ex. vii. 3. The mention tion of these in this connection furnishes an irrefragable historical proof for the fact that not merely in Corinth, but also elsewhere within the sphere of Christianity, phenomena had appeared, which could not be regarded as a mere heightening of natural powers, and that the proclamation of the Gospel in Apostolic times was accompanied by *miracles.* As a special kind of *charismata* appear the δυνάμεις also at 1 Cor. xii. 10, which at once direct attention to the divine agency required and imparted for the working of miracles, and keep their divine purpose alive in the Christian consciousness. The position of the words shows that πνεύματος ἁγίου is not Gen. Subj. (Camero, *etc.*), but Gen. Obj.: that κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν is to be referred only to μερισμοῖς (De Wette), and neither (with Abresch, Böhme) to the whole clause, nor (with Bleek) to ποικίλοις μερισμοῖς; and that αὐτοῦ belongs not to πν. ἁγίου (Œcumen. Carpz.) but to θεοῦ. God communicates the Holy Spirit to believers, yet to no individual one of these His entire fulness, and the distribution takes place in each special appropriation, according to His will and purpose. The Hellenistic θέλησις, Pollux v. 165 calls ἰδιωτικόν.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. With the dignity of the New Testament Mediator, and with the greatness of the salvation which is proffered by Him in the Gospel, stand in corresponding relation the *heaviness of the responsibility* of the hearers of the Gospel, and the *certainty of the condemnation* of its despisers. "The child owes a deeper debt than the servant." (STEIN.) "Strictness and rigor of judgment must stand in relation to infinite grace: the higher the grace, the heavier the punishment. Disobedience to Christ is the thrusting away of our own salvation." (HEUBNER.) The reason lies in the fact that Christ came not to do away with and abolish the law, but to fulfil it, Matt. v. 17. "With heedlessness, disregard and delay commences that which may end in the most fearful plunge into unbelief, disobedience, and their attendant judgment. Heedfulness, on the other hand, is the stepping-stone to faith, obedience, and the bringing forth of fruit in patience. What is more easily neglected, heeded lightly and thrown behind us, than a word which one hears? And yet how is, at the same time, the seed snatched from the heart, from which might grow faith and blessedness! But how frequently also does this word of patience again make its appeal to the heart!" (RIEGER.)

2. The Gospel is not merely in its *subject matter,* but also in its *form,* the most perfect revelation of God. Salvation has not merely appeared, and been introduced into the world by means of the person of the Son of God and Lord of all things—exalted as He is infinitely above the angels—but has also, through the Lord Himself actually found utterance, and received, through His holy and truthful lips, its initiatory proclamation upon earth. "The strictness and rigor of the Old Testament are but a shadow beside the severity of the New." (QUESNEL.)

3. Not merely the *establishment* of Christianity, but also its *maintenance and propagation in* the world, are the work of the Lord. They stand not merely under divine supervision and guidance, but under *divine agency,* in which the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, take their respective share. But we are called not merely to a participation in the blessedness of salvation, but also to coöperation in this work of God, in aid of its actual extension and carrying forward in the world.

4. Christianity has not merely to do with the knowledge and recognition of the truth, but also preëminently with the *procuring of salvation.* But how this is to be accomplished is, under the arrangements of God, announced to us in His word. Precisely for this reason the Gospel of God has been supplied with the most efficient powers, and with the strongest testimonies, and demands of us *personal devotion,* alike in its appropriation to ourselves, and in its propagation.

5. The *distribution* of the gifts and influences of the Holy Spirit in the Church is made neither accidentally nor arbitrarily, but in accordance with the *will of God.* So also the authentication of our testimony by accompanying signs. We must, therefore, neither contemn the lesser and more sparing gifts and signs, nor allow the great, splendid and numerous tokens of such Divine coöperation, to minister to envy, self-exaltation and strife; but mindful of their *origin* and *design,* strive to be found in their possession and use, thankful, humble, industrious and faithful.

6. Taking into account the character of the recipients of our Epistle, this passage contains an irrefutable testimony to the *actual working of miracles* on the part of Jesus and the Apostles. In his appeal to this as a well known and unquestioned fact, the author would have rendered but the slenderest service to his cause, had its reality been open to the slightest shadow of doubt and questioning. Facts like these send to

a common grave the mythological hypothesis regarding the history of Jesus, the naturalistic explanation of the miracles, the denial of the agency of the Holy Spirit, and the restricting to purely historical factors the explanation of the origin of Christianity.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The obligation resting on us to give earnest heed to the Gospel which has come to us through Divine coöperation. 1. How it is demonstrated: *a.* by the greatness of the proffered salvation; *b.* by the excellence of its original Bearer and Proclaimer; *c.* by our being placed in the Church of Jesus Christ. 2. How it finds a hinderance: *a.* in the skeptical spirit of our age; *b.* in the perversity of our own nature; *c.* in the temptations to apostasy from the Church. 3. How God aids to its performance: *a.* by the impressiveness of His judgments; *b.* by confirming the truth and power of the Gospel in history; *c.* by the imparting of His Spirit in His operations and gifts.—In the Gospel alone we are to find a sure means of resistance to the tide which would sweep us to perdition; for these means are: 1, originated by Christ; 2, confirmed of God; 3, made efficacious to our salvation by the Spirit.—With what have we, as preachers, most to do in the proclamation of the Gospel: 1, to see that we preach Christ as the Mediator of salvation to all believers; 2, that our preaching of salvation be found in harmony with that of the Apostles; 3, that the testimony of God in manifold tokens and proofs accompany and confirm our testimony.—To what are we especially to give heed in the hearing of the Gospel? 1, that we learn from it the counsel of God for our eternal blessedness; 2, that we accept it as, in accordance with the will of God, it has been brought to us by a special economy of salvation; 3, that we supplicate the assistance of God for our personal attainment of the salvation that is proffered to us.—It is the earnest will of the Lord that His Gospel be: 1, reverently heard; 2, conscientiously obeyed; 3, powerfully and efficiently spread abroad.—By what we recognize the true miracles of God in history: 1, they serve as signs which accompany the word of His revelation, and direct our attention to the sovereign sway of God in the world; 2, they present themselves as the witnesses of God's pleasure in the proclamation of His word; 3, they evince themselves to be effects of Divine power by their connection with the gifts of the Holy Spirit.—We have no other means of escaping the coming destruction than by giving earnest heed to the Gospel: for 1, the Gospel is not an abrogation, but a confirmation of the Law; hence it, *a.* requires not merely to be heard, but believed and obeyed; and *b.* prophesies of the coming destruction of its contemners; but 2, the Gospel is not a repetion, but a fulfilment of the law; hence it, *a.* preaches in a sure way salvation in Christ; and *b.* is accompanied by God's actual attestations to its truth and power.

Starke:—To whom much is given, of him will also much be required. In the New Testament the light of revelation is much clearer and more glorious than it was amidst the promises and the types of the Old Testament. Bethink thyself, thou who livest in the last time, to what this pledges thee, Luke xii. 48; 2 Cor. vi. 1.—Thou reader of the Holy Scripture, mark well what thou readest, and give heed to the Divine truths which therein are set before thee, since it is God who speaks with thee; for otherwise thy heedlessness will be sorely punished, Matth. xxiv. 15.—The word of the Law has proved steadfast, in respect of the powerful *proofs* of Divinity, to wit, the numerous signs and wonders, which accompanied the giving of the Law; 2, in respect of the *obligation* which it involved to faith and obedience to all the words, commands and prohibitions of the Law; 3, in respect of the *promises* which the Law communicated to him who was obedient in faith, of which promises not one ever fell to the ground; 4, in respect of the *threatenings* with which the law is throughout enforced and confirmed.—God's word, alike Law and Gospel, is unconquerable; it may, perhaps, be assailed, but cannot be overpowered, Luke xvi. 17.—Ah, what blessedness is it that we have the word from the mouth of God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ Himself, confirmed by so many signs and wonders! But precisely according to the greatness of this blessedness is the guilt and punishableness of the unbelief which, notwithstanding this great certainty, still doubts, John v. 38.—The Gospel leads us, indeed, also to our duties, which we have to practise toward God, our neighbor, and ourselves; but the Gospel itself consists in pure blessedness, in the recommending and actual proffering of all the treasures which accompany salvation, Acts xiii. 26.—Although we, perchance, may not have heard the Son of God preach in person, still this will in no way impair our salvation. For even the author of this Epistle (whoever he is), according to his own acknowledgment, had himself not heard the Son of God, but been converted by the Apostles who had heard Him, Luke x. 18.—The Gospel is a doctrine of whose Divine truths we may be convinced even antecedently to, and without miracles; yet God, in accommodation to the weakness of men, has *ex abundanti* added miracles, partly to awaken the needed attention, partly to strengthen the faith already kindled, John xx. 30, 31.—The miracles that have confirmed the Gospel, God has held under His own control in respect of time, place, persons, number, and kind and manner, Ps. lxxii. 18.

Berlenburger Bible:—God uses means for our sakes, but we must ascend *through* the means to their author, and observe the hand of God, so that we may be able to conclude that this and that is the work of God, and not of man. Under the testimony of men, God's procedure and joint testimony are to be recognized, and not to be disjoined from it.—Down to our own day, it is still a characteristic of ordinary conversions, that God, the Lord, who gives richly, does it still *in measure*, that man may recognize it as grace.

Laurentius:—What in spiritual and Divine things we have experienced, seen, and heard, we must also announce to others, that in the hearts of others the same may also be established.

Rambach:—The contemners of the Gospel will be more sorely punished than the transgres-

sors of the law, as they have less excuse for their unbelief.—He who has done evil, seeks to escape judgment, but from the judgment of God there is no escape.—Miracles are 1. no mere matters of accident, but spring from the eternal counsel and purpose of God, to glorify His Son and His Gospel, John ix. 3. 2. They are wrought of God's free will, according as on special occasions it has seemed to Him good. 1 Cor. xii. 11.

STEINHOFER:—Attention to the preached word is most powerfully urged upon us by the importance 1. of the person who has spoken to us of such things; 2. of the subject-matter which is thus revealed and tendered to us—The proofs which formerly confirmed this word, have, in the lapse of time, lost none of their power.—We desire no other Gospel—as, in fact, there is no other—than that which we have heard from Him, and have believed.

PHIL. MATTH. HAHN:—Reasons for attention to the Gospel: 1. The Lord has spoken; 2. the word speaks of pure salvation; 3. it has been sealed by Divine testimony.

RIEGER:—To refuse to give heed to the counsel of God for our salvation in the Gospel, is a heavier crime than to violate His law. In the case of the law, it is a *cannot*, of the Gospel, a *will not*.

HEUBNER:—Disobedience to Christ is a thrusting away of our own salvation.

KLUGE:—The nobler the hope, the more earnest the sanctification.

FRICKE:—As a kernel in the shell lies our whole salvation in the words of Christ. They are all fraught with meaning; here is salvation: hear and embrace!—The additions to the word, which salvation furnishes to us, God gives neither according to reckoning, nor according to desert, but according to His *will*.—What takes place in the kingdom of Christ, will always bear Christ's impress upon it.

[OWEN:—Diligent attendance unto the word of the Gospel, is indispensably necessary unto perseverance in the profession of it.—The profession of most of the world is a mere non-renunciation of the Gospel in words, while in their hearts and lives they deny the power of it every day.—If the ministration of the Gospel be not looked on as that which is full of glory, it will never be attended unto.—The word heard is not lost without the *great sin*, as well as the *inevitable ruin*, of the souls of men.—It is meet that the Gospel should be armed with threatenings as well as promises.—A sceptre in a kingdom, without a sword—a crown without a rod of iron, will quickly be trampled on.—The threatenings of future penalties on the disobedient, are far more clear and express in the Gospel than in the Law].

IV.

The exaltation of Jesus above the Angels, is not disparaged by His earthly life, which rather effects the elevation of humanity.

CHAPTER II. 5–13.

5 For unto the angels hath he not [For not unto the angels did he] put in subjec-
6 tion the world to come, whereof we speak [are speaking]. But one in a certain place
testified, saying, What is[1] [a] man, that thou art mindful of him? or the [a] son of man,
7 that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou
crownedst him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the works of thy hands
8 [*om*. and didst set him over the works of thy hands][2]: Thou hast [didst] put all things
in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left
nothing *that is* not put [in subjection] under him. But now we see not yet all things
9 put under him. But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels [but
him who has for some little been made lower than the angels, Jesus, we see] for the
[on account of his] suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the
10 grace of God[3] should [might] taste death for every man. For it became him, for
whom *are* all things, and by whom *are* all things, in bringing [as one who brought]
many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.
11 For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified *are* all of [from] one: for which
12 cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, Saying, I will declare thy name unto
my brethren, in the midst of the church [congregation] will I sing praise unto thee.
13 And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, Behold I and the children which
God hath given me [that God gave to me].

[1] Ver. 6.—The reading *τίς ἐστιν* (LACH. *Ed. Stereot.* and *Bl.*) is not sufficiently supported.

[2] Ver. 7.—The *lect. rec.* *Καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου*, deemed spurious by Mill, bracketed by Lachman, cancelled since Griesbach, is a gloss from the LXX. The author has omitted it in citation as unnecessary to his purpose. It is found, however, in the original text of Cod. Sin.

[3] Ver. 9.—The reading *χωρὶς θεοῦ*, *without*, or *apart from God* (instead of *χάριτι θεοῦ*), preferred by Orig. and Theod. Mops., known by Jerome, made use of by Ambr., Fulgent. and Vigil. Thaps., strongly insisted on by the Nestorians, defended by Beng., Ebr., *etc.*, is found only in Cod. 53 (Griesb.) of the 9 or 10 Cent., and Cod 67 of the 11 or 12 Cent., and in the latter only on the margin. [For *χωρὶς θεοῦ*, which Theod. Mops. and Ebr., find eminently in place, no natural and appropriate meaning can here be found; while *χάριτι θεοῦ*, which Ebr. denounces as flat and uncalled for, is eminently to the writer's purpose, as commending the arrangement which involved the crucifixion of the Messiah, as one called for and originated by *the grace of God*. It would seem probable that *χωρὶς θεοῦ* may have originally been placed on the margin opposite ver. 8, limiting the expression, "he left nothing unsubjected to him"—'except God,' after 1 Cor. xv. 27, and that a subsequent copyist, misled by the resemblance of *χωρὶς θεοῦ* to *χάριτι θεοῦ*, substituted it in the text. At all events its history is curious, but the internal evidence is decisively against it.—K.].

[Ver. 5.—*οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλοις*, *for not unto angels*—*it is not to angels that he subjected, etc.* Ἀγγέλοις without the Art., as marking not the individuals, but the class, and emphatic in its position —*ὑπέταξεν*, *he subjected*, Aor.; not, *hath subjected*.—*τὴν οἰκουμένην*. There are three words commonly rendered, *world:* 1. Κόσμος properly the world as a harmoniously adjusted and orderly system of things; this is never used in the phrase, the "world to come;" 2. *αἰών*, *age, duration of time*, and hence the world as constituting a particular period of time, or age; so commonly *ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος*, *this age, this world*, and *αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων*, *the coming or future age or world*; 3. *ἡ οἰκουμένη* (*γῆ*), the world as a *locality* and as *inhabited;* the world in a more *concrete* character than is expressed by *αἰών*.

Ver. 6.—*τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος*. De Wette, Del., Alf. render as=*ὁ ἄνθρωπος*, *man*, collectively, as Eng. Ver.: Moll and Lün. *a man*, individually, which accords better with the absence of the article.

Ver. 7.—*βραχύ τι*, *some little*, in the Hebr. text, and in the citation, ver. 7, in relation to man, is "a *paululum* of degree;" in its *application* by the author to Jesus, ver. 9, it becomes a "*paululum* of time," Del., contrasting his temporary humiliation with his permanent exaltation.

Ver. 9.—*διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου*, *on account of his suffering of death*, referring forward to *ἐστεφ*, *crowned*. The Eng. ver. "*for the suffering*," *etc.*, suggests an erroneous reference, or is at least ambiguous.—For the general construction of ver. 9 see exegetical notes.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 5. **For not unto angels did He put in subjection the coming world of which we are speaking.**—The *γάρ* refers not back to ch. i. 13 (de W.), nor *in form* to the preceding exhortation, while, *in fact*, introducing an entirely new thought, parallel to the preceding, *viz.*, that in the Son humanity is exalted above the angels (Ebr.). Nor does it introduce the ground on which the author has assigned to the revelation made through the Son a so much loftier position (Thol.), but rather the ground for the *earnest exhortation* to personal devotion to the system of salvation revealed through the Son. Jewish conceptions assigned to the angels a share, not merely in the giving of the Law, but also in the government of the world, and especially in influencing the events of history. It is uncertain whether Ps. lxxxii. has such a reference; but the LXX., in rendering the obscure words, Deut. xxxii. 8 (that God, when He fixed the heritage of the nations and separated the children of men from one another, fixed the limits of the nations according to the number of the sons of Israel), makes the division to take place according to *the number of the angels of God*. In the following verse it is then said that the people of Israel are the portion of Jehovah Himself. The same idea is found, Sir. xvii. 17, and with many Rabbins, who, on the ground of the list of nations, Gen. x., assume for the seventy nations seventy angelic heads and rulers, while Israel, excepted from the number, is the special and privileged people of the Supreme God. At Dan. x. 13, 20; xxi. 12, however, we find the representation that the Jews also have such an angelic prince, who takes in charge this people as against the guardian angels of other nations; and at Tob. xii. 15, the seven archangels are regarded as the angelic protectors of the covenant people; and at Dan. iv. 14, the fate announced to Nebuchadnezzar is indicated as the decision of the "Watchers," and the decree of the "Holy Ones." From these passages is explained the mode of expression here employed, in regard to which we may also recollect that the LXX. render the designation of the Messiah, Is. ix. 6, (אֲבִי־עַד), according to the Cod. Alex. by *πατὴρ τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος*, *Father of the coming age*. For it is not a mere absolute futurity which is meant (Theodoret, Œc., Grot., Schulz), but the Messianic world (Calv.). And the order of the words, too, shows that the contrast is not between the future and the preceding world (Camero, Bl.), but, as indicated also by the absence of the Art. with *ἀγγ.*, between *angelic* existences and *man*, to which latter class the Messianic King sustains a relation entirely unlike that which he bears to the former.

VER. 6. **But some one testified in a certain place.**—Here is not the commencement of a new section (Heinr.), but the adversative *δέ* subjoins a contrast to the idea referred to and denied in the preceding clause, and over against that idea presents in a contrast indicated by its Scriptural citation, the *real nature* of the case. The indefiniteness of the form of citation (*πού*, *somewhere*), occurring also with Philo, (Carpz.), and with many Rabbins (Schöttg.), implies not that, as against the inscription which refers the Psalm to David, the author would ascribe it to some unknown person (Grot.), which would imply a critical habit not at this time existing; nor that, quoting from memory, he did not know the precise locality of the passage (Koppe, Schulz),—a supposition negatived partly by the verbal exactness of the citation, partly by the like mode of citing a passage entirely familiar, ch. iv. 4 (Lün.); nor that, regarding God or the Holy Spirit as the proper Author of the passage, he was indifferent to its human writer (Bl.), in which case *τὶς* would hardly have been employed; but is probably a usage purely rhetorical (so the majority after Chrys.). For that God Himself is addressed in this well known passage (Ebr.) is a matter on which no stress need be laid, since the author either might have made the *Scripture* the subject, or employed a passive construction.

What is a man — all things under his feet. — The connection of the words in Ps. viii. 5-7 shows that man, as אֱנוֹשׁ, in contrast with heaven and the shining stars which God has ordained, is conceived immediately in his *frailty* and *earthly low-*

liness, and it is purely arbitrary to introduce here,—whether into the original text, or the conception of our author (Kuin., Heinr., Böhm., Bl., Stein, Lün.),—the idea of the *glory* and *dignity* of man. We find rather the preceding words of the Psalm expressing the idea that God is not stumbled, so to speak, by this natural inferiority of man, but displays His own glory in selecting from such an humble sphere His instruments of victory for the confusion of His enemies. After reminding us, ver. 2, that God, whose majesty is extolled above the heavens, has also a mighty name upon the earth, the Psalmist declares in ver. 3 that out of the mouth of children and sucklings He has prepared to Himself a power against His adversaries, to subdue the enemy, the seeker of vengeance.' On this follows (ver. 4) the wondering gaze at the heavens, the work of the fingers of God, and then, ver. 5, the contrasted reference to the twofold nature of man, appearing, on the one hand, frail and impotent, as a mortal dweller on the earth, as a creature of dust, and, on the other, not merely an object of loving care, but an *instrument*, preferred before all creatures, for the execution of the will of God. The subsequent delineations of the Psalm show that the reference is to that position of sovereignty which, according to the account of creation, man has received by virtue of his possession of the Divine image. Precisely for this reason it is added: "Thou hast made him to fall short but little of Deity." *Elohim* without the Art. expresses abstractly *the Divine* in its super-terrestrial character,—nay, 1 Sam. xxviii. 13; Zech. xii. 19, the super-terrestrial in general, such as appertains to spirits. The Psalmist thus says, not that man is made almost equal to Jehovah, but that he has received almost a supra-terrestrial nature and position. Hence the LXX. in place of Elohim put παρ' ἀγγέλους. But the words of the text do not justify Calov, Vitr., Stier, Ebr., in taking not merely the βραχύ τι of the Sept., but even the Heb. מְעַט, not, of *degree*, but, of *time*, in the sense, "Thou hast for a season let him fall short of Elohim, *i. e.*, of the intercourse and presence of the world-ruling Deity in His glory, which the angels, as inhabitants of heaven, always enjoy." Equally unwarranted is the assumption that this glory of man is a glory as yet merely *promised* by God, and that the hope of the Psalmist looks to its speedy realization. For the "falling short" or "lacking" is not transferred back to the past, nor the 'crowning' carried forward to the future; but the two are represented as contemporaneous, and the description refers to man, not after the Fall, but in his primitive and normal condition. Precisely for these reasons can the words be applied to the Messiah, and the application made by our author, ver. 9, is facilitated by the expression, "Son of Man." But it finds in this expression, neither its occasion nor its substantial reason, and the nature of the argument rather requires us here to regard the author as applying the parallel terms, 'man' and "Son of man," to mankind in general (Bez., Storr, Ebr., Del.), than to assume in the original a direct reference of these words to Christ (Bl., Lün.), and thus interpolate here the quite differently applied train of thought which is found at 1 Cor. xv. 25 ff.*

VER. 8. **For in subjecting to him all things he has left nothing.**—The author proceeds to draw from the words of the Psalmist a conclusion which introduces the proof of the position laid down in ver. 5. The subject of the verb is not the Psalmist, but God (iii. 15; viii. 13), and αὐτῷ refers not to the Son of man, either as appearing in Christ as a historical person (Calv., Gerh., Calov, Seb. Schmidt, Lün., *etc.*), or simply as ideally conceived, but to *man as such*, as immediate object of Ps. viii. (Bez., Grot., Schlicht, Ebr., Del.). But neither is it his purpose to make good and justify the declaration of the Psalmist (Hofm.). This rests on the statement of Gen. i. 28. It is rather to justify the declaration of the author that God has not subjected to angels the future world of which we speak. This is done by an appeal to the infallible word of Scripture that God has subjected *every thing to man:* this declaration admits no exception. It cannot be objected to the legitimacy of this conclusion, that the Psalmist is speaking of the *present*, and our author of the *future* world, and that he is thus unwarranted in including the οἰκουμ. μέλλ. in the category of the "all things." With partial correctness, Del. remarks, after Hofm.: The world, as collective aggregate of what is created, coincides with the generic term, "all things," and the present and future world are not two different things, comprehended under the τὰ πάντα, but they are the τὰ πάντα—the *all things* themselves, only in two distinct and successive forms. Still I would rather lay the *emphasis* on the fact that οἰκ. μέλλ. denotes the Messianic world as that in which alone the Divine destination of man to dominion over all things can have its accomplishment. By this, attention is at once directed partly to the present position of the human race, not yet corresponding with its destiny, and partly to that fulfilment of the Divine declaration which, through Jesus the Messianic King, has been already commenced, and is pledged to an absolute completion.

But now we see not as yet all things subjected to him.—The νῦν δέ is not *logical*,=*but as the case stands, in fact*, but directs our eyes to the earthly *present*, which shows the universe as yet not in a condition answering to its destination. By this the certain fulfilment of the divine declaration, is indeed held out in prospect for a more perfect future. But this aspect of

[* By a failure to recognize this, the course of thought must be inextricably entangled. By referring the '*him*' already in ver. 8 to Jesus, we are obliged, in order to extract any sense out of the passage, to make a false distinction between Jesus' being already "crowned with glory and honor," as but a first step in his elevation, and an ultimate and more complete glorification. Such a distinction, we scarcely need say, is not in the author's mind at all. "Crowned with glory and honor" is repeated in ver. 9 as the exponent and representative of all the dignity and dominion expressed in the preceding verses; and the contrast is not between Jesus now partially exalted in token of His future complete exaltation, and that future *complete* exaltation, but between *man*, as such, not yet in himself exalted to his true original destination, and Jesus, the representative Man, thus exalted in Himself, and as the Leader of the destinies of humanity. Thus by taking 'man' and 'him,' through vv. 7, 8, in their natural sense, and then, when it appears that in this sense the language of the Psalm is not fully borne out, *applying* them to the God-Man, we make the connection and the reasoning perfect.—K.].

the subject the author is not now unfolding. To assume (with Lün), a contrast between that which we now see and that which we shall yet see, disturbs the connection, and is inconsistent with the following verse. The purpose of the author is to prove that the future or Messianic world—the world of redemption—that world which forms the proper subject of communication between him and his readers—is as far as the original world, which began with creation, from being subjected to angelic beings. Hence he institutes a double contrast of that which we now do not see: primarily a contrast with the declaration immediately preceding [*viz.* the inferential statement that God subjecting to man all things, has left nothing unsubjected to him]; and, secondly, a contrast with that which we now already see [*viz.*, Jesus glorified in advance, and for the sake of, humanity.] Even the δέ in our passage should have awakened a suspicion against the common assumption that we have here an *objection* to the declaration of the Psalm, or a limitation of our author's previous position inferentially derived from it. [Νῦν has here, with nearly all interpreters, the temporal signification. While entirely coinciding with the author's general exposition, which cites the passage from the Psalm in its primary literal acceptation, and then draws out from it, by legitimate reasoning, its proper Messianic application, I yet incline strongly to the *logical* explanation of νῦν. The closing clause of ver. 8: "For in subjecting to Him all things, *etc.*," is purely logical. It seems more natural that the next should commence with a logical particle, and it is precisely because the author (as Moll maintains above) is not yet contrasting the present with the future; but an actual condition with an ideal condition, that I prefer to take νῦν in the purely logical sense, which is not inconsistent with the *not yet*, (or possibly *not at all*) of the οὔπω. I would thus render, "But as it is, in no way," or, "But as it is, not yet do we see," *etc.* Still, if we forbear to *press* the νῦν, its temporal acceptation harmonizes nearly as well with the reasoning as the logical. I wish to add that the passage, rightly expounded, is a beautiful specimen of the author's skilful and profound manner of dealing with Scripture; or, perhaps we should rather say, it is a striking example of a commentary by the Spirit of inspiration on a passage which the Spirit had indited.—K.].

VER. 9. **But him who has been for a little humbled below the angels, Jesus, we behold—honor.** The position and import of the word 'Jesus,' standing in close connection with the finite verb βλέπομεν, and between the two Perf. Part. ἠλαττ. and ἐστεφ., of which the former has the Art. the latter not, present to us the *historical Saviour* as the person in whom the language of the Psalm has its fulfilment. The object is not a direct contrast between as yet unexalted humanity, and the already exalted Jesus, nor between the humiliation and exaltation of the Messiah; but simply this, to declare that that Jesus who was once, for a little, humbled below the angels, is well known as a person crowned on account of His suffering of death with glory and honor, and that to Him must be referred the words of the Psalm, because also now, *i. e.*, in the period of redemption and the time of the Messiah, these infallible words of the Psalm can apply to no other "man" and "Son of man" than Jesus. While HOFMANN formerly (Weiss. II. 28) regarded τὸν ἠλαττ. as predicate, Ἰησοῦν as obj. and ἐστεφ. as its apposition, he now more correctly regards (Schriftb. I. 187) τὸν ἠλαττ. as object., Ἰησ. as in apposition with it, and ἐστεφ. as predicate. This construction is, on grammatical grounds, preferable to that adopted by Ebr. and Del., which makes Ἰησ. the proper object of βλέπ., and ἠλαττ. its apposition, placed before it on purely rhetorical grounds.* True, Lün. goes too far in maintaining that Ἰησ. is wholly unemphatic, and could even be dispensed with. But the emphasis lies certainly on the predicates formed from the words of the Psalm, which describe the two contrasted conditions of *the Lord*, and hence inclose as it were between them the historical name of His person. The subjection of the world under man we as yet see not; but we see the man really characterized by the Psalm, *viz*: Jesus, in whose history we at the same time recognize the deeper significance of its words, and learn to give to the words, "lowered a little below the angels" a new and profounder import. The Messianic application of Psalm viii. is made in a different way by Jesus Himself at Matt. xxi. 16, and again in still another way by Paul 1 Cor. xv. 27. In both cases, however, Jesus is regarded as the 'Lord,' equal to God; and as such is also the doctrine of our author, we need not, by our anxiety to retain the historical sense of the βραχύ τι, be misled into the rendering of Hofm., "Him who was well-nigh equal to the angels." The transition of the βραχύ τι of degree into the βραχύ τι of *time* is all the more easy, from the fact that on the one hand the *meaning of the phrase* is in clasical Greek more commonly *temporal*, and that, on the other, the actual state of the case, man's inferiority to angels, having its ground in his corporeal and mortal nature, is but transient, and limited to his earthly life; while for Jesus, this period of His life, being already completely finished, belongs now to the past. We are, in like manner, to reject Hofmann's reference of the words: "crowned with glory and honor," to the *furnishing out* and *endowing* of Jesus at His entrance into the world, or to His designation and appointment as Saviour; also his idea that the "suffering of death" refers to that suffering of death to which man, instead of enjoying his destined sovereignty, is subjected, and which, consequently, becomes thus the *occasioning* cause of the appointment of Jesus as Saviour. For Christ's appointment as Saviour is indicated in the words, "lowered for some little below the angels," while His "crown-

* [Hofmann's first construction would be: But Jesus, having been, on account of His suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor, we behold as one who has been for a little humbled below the angels, *i. e.*=we behold this being to have been for a little, *etc.* The latter, and unquestionably more correct construction is: 'But Him who has been for a little humbled below the angels, *viz.*, Jesus, we behold on account of His suffering of death [to have been and to be now] crowned with glory and honor,' and thus fulfilling in His own person that language of the Psalm, which in humanity proper is not fulfilled. This construction is equally natural, elegant and suited to the context.—K.].

ing" is constantly referred in the New Testament to His heavenly reward, obtained after His successful and victorious life-conflict of suffering and of faith; while again, His suffering of death appears as the *ground and procuring cause* of His glorification, (v. 10; Phil. ii. 9). Precisely for this reason also we are to refer the διὰ τὸ πάθ. τοῦ θαν., not (with Orig., Chrys., Theod., Aug., Bez., Calov, *etc.*,) to ἠλαττ. but to ἐστεφ. as is also indicated by its position in the sentence.

That by the grace of God, on behalf of every man, he might taste of death.—The clause commencing with ὅπως [in order that=ἵνα] and thence introducing not a mere *result* (Eras., Kuin., *etc.*) but *purpose*, cannot, from the nature of the thought, be connected directly with ἐστεφ. ["crowned in order that"], nor from the structure of the sentence with ἠλαττ., but must be regarded either as a pregnant exponent of πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου, (Thol., Lün.), or as belonging to the entire participial predicative clause —[*i. e.*, "crowned on account," *etc.*]—(Del.) and thus assigning the reason why Jesus was exalted, not without the suffering of death, and even on account of it; or, according to my view, as final object of the two-fold declaration respecting Christ's transfer into His two successive states of humiliation and glorification. With this explanation accords best the reasoning of the following verse; and in the present final clause itself, the author's main point is not to explain why Jesus has gone *through suffering* to glory (with which understanding Grot., Carpz., Storr, Bleek, *etc.*, supply, from the preceding πάθημα, an explanatory ὃ ἔπαθεν) but to declare the object to be subserved alike by the incarnation of the First Born, and the exaltation of the Crucified One in the inseparable unity of the theanthropic person Jesus, *viz.*: the fulfilment of the divine purpose, that Jesus should, by the grace of God, for the benefit of every one, taste of death. There is no reason for laying the entire stress on ὑπὲρ παντός, although the masc. sing. is employed with a designed emphasis. The weight of the thought is rather distributed nearly equally between the impressive closing words γεύσηται θανάτου, *taste of death*, the ὑπὲρ παντός, which declares the *universality* of the purpose and merit of His death, accomplished by His entrance into glory, and the χάριτι θεοῦ which refers back the whole, for its efficient and originating cause, to the *grace of God.* (We add, in passing, that the γεύσηται θανάτου *taste of death* refers neither to brevity of duration—simply "tasting," (as Chrys., Primas., Braun, *etc.*,) nor to the bitterness of the death (Calov), nor to its reality (Beza, Bengel), but presupposes Jesus' personal experience of the suffering of death and his incarnation). Even the reading χωρὶς θεοῦ would not necessarily require more than a secondary stress to be laid upon ὑπὲρ παντός. This would be the most natural, as also would the *neuter* rendering of παντός (*every thing*), only in case we take the thought to be that Jesus suffered death for all existences, with the single exception of God (Orig., Theodor., Ebr.), contrary to ver. 16; or, in order, with the exception of God, to gain and subjugate every thing to Himself (Beng., Chrys., Fr. Schmidt); the *thought* in this case being parallel to that Eph. i. 10, and the form of expression to 1 Cor. xv. 27. Other interpreters take the words χωρὶς θεοῦ as an independent characterization, either of the *subject* of the clause [Christ separately from God], or of the *verb* [taste of death apart from God]. The former is advocated by Theod. Mops. and his pupil Nestorius, by Ambros., Fulgent., and Colomesius, (*Obb. sacr.* 603), who thus made Christ to have died in His humanity, without participation of His divinity: the latter, with a reference to Matt. xxvii. 46, by PAUL., and BAUMGART., (*Sach.* I. 359, and in the Sermon: "How the sight of Jesus, amidst the woes of life, suffices for our blessedness, Brunsw. 1856). HOFM., who formerly explained thus (*Weiss.* I. 92): "Jesus has tasted death, χωρὶς θεοῦ, by surrendering to death a life (commencing in time), separated from God," has abandoned both the interpretation and the reading on which it was based. The dispute regarding its genuineness is ancient. For while Orig. (at John i. 1) declares that he had found the reading χάριτι only ἔν τισι ἀντιγράφοις, JEROME (*ad Gal.* i. 2) has, in like manner, found *absque Deo* only *in quibusdam exemplaribus.*

VER. 10. **For it became him—perfect through sufferings,**—it seems, at first view, more natural to find the stress of the thought in διὰ παθημάτων (Lün., Del.) than in τελειῶσαι (Thol.), by which διὰ παθημάτων is reduced to a mere secondary and incidental place. In the former case, the way so offensive to the Jews, which leads the Messiah to glory through *suffering and death*, is here justified as entirely worthy of God. In the other case, we should have the thought expressed that it was indispensable that He should be *glorified Himself*, who became to others the author of salvation. But the connection demands an equal emphasis upon both points, to which also corresponds the two-fold description of God as the Being *by* whom and *for* whom are all things. *God*—not Christ, as (Prim., Hunn., Dorsch., Cram., *etc.*)—is designated as the *final* cause (*for* whom), and the *instrumental* cause (by or *through* whom) of all, in order, at the same time, to remind the reader that alike the τελείωσις, *perfecting*, which is the *end*, and the παθήματα, *sufferings*, which are the *means*, stand respectively in corresponding relation to those respective aspects of God's being and agency. The perfecting (τελειοῦν) embraces at once the outward and the inward, the formal and the spiritual elements of perfecting, ch. ix. 9, the bringing the person to the goal by the complete realization and fulfilment of his entire destiny (Thol.), so that the reaching of the highest outward goal is the consequence of internal moral perfection (Camero, de W.). For the *perfect* (τέλειον) stands in contrast alike with the *incipient*, the *imperfect*, and the *unrealized* (Köstl.). Lün. takes the idea too restrictedly as identical with δόξ. καὶ τιμ. ἐστεφ.

As leading many sons—perfect through sufferings.—We might be inclined to refer the participial clause, "leading many sons," *etc.*, to Jesus, as in apposition with "Leader of their salvation," (ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας), but placed emphatically before it as in ver. 9 (so Primas., Erasm., Este, Ebr., Win.). And to this neither the absence of the Art. before ἀγαγόντα (Böhm., Bl.), nor the expression υἱούς, *sons* (Lün.), consti-

tutes any objection. For as to the former, the participial clause is only made by the failure of the Art., *subordinate* to its noun [the Leader, as one who led] instead of being *coördinated* with it as in case of the employment of the Art. [the Leader who led]; and as to the latter we might say that while those brought to glory are indeed *brethren of Christ*, yet here they are mentioned not, in their relation to Him, as *brethren*, but in their relation to God as *sons*, especially as God is the subject of the entire sentence. But the word ἀρχηγός (xii. 2; Acts iii. 15; v. 31) needs no explanatory apposition (Lün.). It is an abridged form of ἀρχεγέτης, with which Philo designates the first Adam, and it denotes him who, at the head of a company, goes in advance of them, and leads them to a like goal; it thus passes over into the sense of *author*, *originator*, and becomes=αἴτιος (*Bl.* II. 1, p. 302). The goal is here 'salvation' (σωτηρία), to which 'glory' (δόξα) in the participial clause is entirely equivalent. We refer, therefore (with Chrys., Luth., Calov, and most intpp.), this participial clause more fittingly to God, of whom then the same is said, as the expression, "Leader of their salvation," declares in reference to Christ. He is author of salvation for a great number of children, who are styled 'many,' not in the sense of '*all*,' (Seb. Schmidt), and not in antithesis to all, but in contrast to 'few,' and in relation to 'the One' (Del.). The irregular Acc. ἀγαγόντα (for Dat. ἀγαγόντι) cannot be urged (as by Carpz., Mich., *etc.*) against this construction; for the Accus. is the natural case for the subject of the Inf., whence also transitions into it are frequent in spite of a preceding Dat. (Kühn., *Gr.* II., 346; Bernh. *Synt.*, 367; Buttm. *Gr. N. Test.*, 1859, p. 262).

The Aor. Part. (ἀγαγόντα) was formerly commonly taken in the sense of the Pluperf., and was applied, if it was referred to *God* as subject, to the saints of the Old Test., as Hofm. even still says (II., 1, 39): "The God who has led many sons to glory, a Moses to the prophetic, an Aaron to the high-priestly, a David to the royal dignity, must render *this* Son, to whom He had given as His distinguishing vocation, the realization of that destiny of humanity which is set forth in Ps. viii., perfect through suffering." If, on the contrary, the Part. were referred to Christ, then they were applied (as still by Win. *Gr. Ed.* 6) to the men *already* saved through the personal instructions of Jesus. But it is alike inadmissible to weaken the idea of δόξα, *glory*, hitherto used of Christ's heavenly glorification, into the lower conception of an earthly, prophetic, priestly, or kingly dignity, and to make the *teachings* of Jesus, exclusively of His glorious exaltation acquired by sufferings, the cause of salvation. All more recent investigations, however, show that the restricting of the Aor. Part. to the *past*—a restriction already previously abandoned in reference to the Infin.—is inadmissible. The *future* signification which many expositors, as even Grotius and Bleek, following Erasmus, give to the participle, is certainly unwarrantable. And to refer it again (with Grot., Limb., Schlicht.), to the eternal purpose and decree of God, though justified by Kuinoel on the ground of an utterly erroneous canon of the earlier Rhetoricians, that the Aor. can be used *de conatu*, is, of course, to be rejected. "Customary" action may, indeed, be denoted by the Aor., but we are forbidden to assume such a use here, by the fact that we are required by the term ἀρχηγός to restrict the "Sons" spoken of to the New Testament times, excluding those of the Old. [I would add, that there is no such use of the Aor. *Participle* to denote customary action, as would, in any case, justify the construction here supposed.—K.]. This difficulty is evaded by Tholuck's assumption, that, here, without respect to relations of time, the Part. expresses the simple *way and manner* of the perfection, claiming that the Aor. connected with the finite verb, may express that which is *contemporaneous* with the finite verb, whether mention of this be present or future. To this Lün. objects, that while the Aor. Infin. may be thus used irrespectively of time, this usage does not extend to the Part., and that ἀγαγόντα cannot express the way and manner of the τελειῶσαι—the perfecting—inasmuch as the personal *objects* of the two verbs are different, ἀγαγόντα having for its object υἱούς, *sons*, and τελειῶσαι, the Captain, τὸν ἀρχηγόν. The former remark, however, does not touch the examples adduced by Tholuck; and the latter appears to rest on a misapprehension. For the "perfecting" of Jesus, as 'Leader of salvation,' has been historically accomplished in His person *in no other way and manner* than by having had personally His career and course of life *in a communion and fellowship* of men believing on Him, and transformed by Him into children of God, who, after His manner and type, were led to glory—(a manner and type which Jac., Cappell. and Grot. restrict too exclusively to sufferings). To this also comes substantially the explanation of Lün. himself, *viz.*, that from the stand-point of the writer, the participial clause stands in *causal* relation to the main proposition, and that the Aor. Part. is justified by the fact that in reality God, from the moment Christ came upon earth as Redeemer, and found faith existing, led to glory, that is, put upon the *way* to glory, those who had become believers in Him.

[The knot of the difficulty of the Aor. Part. ἀγαγόντι is scarcely yet untied. That it may grammatically be equally well referred either to *God*, or to the 'Leader of salvation,' Christ, seems unquestionable; and in either construction it makes nearly equally good sense, and is liable substantially to the same difficulties. Granting it, however (as with most, I, on the whole, prefer), to be connected with God (to which, as Moll justly remarks, and for the reason which he assigns, the Acc. case of the Part. constitutes no objection), it still remains a question why, and in precisely what sense, the Aor. Part. is used. That, like the Inf., it can be used without specific reference to *past* time, and that, in a certain sense, it takes its time from its accompanying finite verb, is unquestionable. It usually thus either denotes an act actually, or *ideally* and *logically* separable from that expressed by the finite verb, and conceived as logically prior to it, or, as remarked by Thol., expresses its *way* and *manner*. Thus to give examples of its several uses:

1. Of its frequent use as applied to *past* time: "God, *after speaking* (λαλήσας) to the Fathers,

spoke to us," *etc.* "Opening (ἀνοίξαντες) their treasures, they presented." They opened their treasures and presented.

2. Of contemporaneous action actually distinct: "On seeing (ἰδόντες) the star, they rejoiced." They saw the star *before* they could rejoice, and yet they rejoiced as soon as they saw the star. Logically, the seeing preceded the rejoicing: chronologically they were simultaneous.

3. A still stronger case of the merely *logical* separation: "Answering (ἀποκριθείς) he said= he answered and said. The 'answering' and 'saying' are absolutely and completely one and the same act, but the mind views it under two distinct aspects, and of these the 'answering' is logically anterior to the 'saying.' So "Jesus crying with a loud voice, said, Father," *etc.*, here, as in the preceding, the distinction of time is purely logical, the 'crying' and 'saying' being two aspects of the same act.

4. These latter examples often run into *way* and *manner:* "Answering, he said"="he answered and said," or nearly=he said in the way of answering. Πιὼν φάρμακον ἀπέθανεν, 'he drank poison and died,' or here more exactly, "he died of drinking poison." Plato does not mean to say (*Phæd.* I.) "after drinking poison he died," but "he drank poison and died," or better, "he died by drinking poison." Hence the Aor. Part. sometimes denotes almost or quite purely, 'way and manner.'

5. We may remark, that the Aor. Part. may be employed to denote an idea that is strictly *subordinate* to that of the accompanying verb, or really *coördinate* with it, and of equal, or even superior importance. Thus, 'He directed me coming (ἐλθόντα) to inform him,' might be either, 'he directed me *after coming*, to inform him,' or 'to *come* and inform him;' and only the connection can show whether the act expressed by the Part. is *included* in the command, or only *presupposed* by it. Thus "He commanded him, arising, (ἐγερθέντα) to take the child and flee," might be either "*on* or *after* arising, to take the child and flee," or to *arise* and take, *etc.* The connection only can positively determine.

In view of the above, the natural renderings of the Aor. Part. here would be: 1. (with Hofm.). It became him, *etc.*, "*after leading* many sons to glory," which, however, is nearly impossible as to the thought, even after rejecting Hofmann's absurd reference of it to Christ's Old Testament predecessors, and referring it, as we might possibly do, to all the righteous whom God had formerly led to glory. One grand objection to this is, that the Old Testament saints had not as yet been led to glory (ch. xii. 39, 40). Or 2. It became him "*by leading* many sons to glory," with Thol. making the Part. express the *way* and *manner*. To this, however, Lünemann's objection is valid, that then the Part. and the verb *ought* to have the same personal object, as it seems difficult to see how God could perfect Jesus, *one* being, by leading many sons, *other* beings, to glory, unless we reply with Moll that the career of our Lord was so intimately blended with the life of His people, that His perfection was really accomplished in the process—not exclusively of suffering—by which they were brought to glory. This answer is ingenious, but hardly satisfactory. Or 3. Taking the Part. not as expressing a *subordinate*, but a *coördinate* or principal idea: It became him *to lead* many sons, *etc.*, *and* to make: which, however, it must be confessed, hardly seems to be the writer's idea. To render the Part. as *future, being about to lead*, or *for the purpose of leading* (ἄξοντα or ὡς ἄξοντα), or as present *while leading* (ἄγοντα), is out of the question. It is, indeed, possible to render it 'as leading' absolutely,='as one who led;' and this perhaps, all things considered, is the best mode of constructing it. But this is harsh, and I know of no strictly parallel examples in Greek prose. Exceptional constructions in the poets are hardly worth the citing, even if they can be found. Were there even any slight external authority for ἄγοντα or ἄξοντα, on internal grounds I should hardly hesitate to adopt it. The rendering of the Eng. vers., 'in bringing many sons,' *etc.*, would naturally require ἐν τῷ ἄγειν, or at the least, the Pres. Part., ἄγοντα.—K.].

VER. 11. **For both he that sanctifieth and they—are all from one.**—Having designated Jesus as the 'Son of God,' the author now justifies his application of the same term to those who believe in Him. Not barely the One, but also the others (τε—καί); not merely the Sanctified (Peirce, Beng.), but they together with the Sanctifier, *i. e.*, with Jesus Christ (ix. 13; xiii. 12), are from One. "From one" (ἐξ ἑνός) expresses not likeness of nature and character (*ejusdem naturæ et conditionis spiritualis*, Calv., Camero), but simply community of origin; and this not *ex communi massa* (J. Cappell, Akersloot); not "from one *seed*, or *blood*, or *stock*," (ἐξ ἑνός scil. σπέρματος, or αἵματος, or γένους, as Carpz., Abresch, *etc.*); nor from *Adam* (Erasm., Bez., Este, *etc.*), but from *God*. For the language relates not to that relationship subsequently adverted to ver. 14, by joint participation *in humanity*, but to spiritual brotherhood with Christ, a brotherhood founded in that translation from the darkness of a life estranged from God into a union with Him as the perfectly pure and absolute and essential light, which Christ, as the *Sanctifier*, has wrought for us as the *sanctified*. This is effected, as is subsequently shown, by the *high-priestly* work, which Jesus Christ, as eternal Priestly King, accomplishes in heaven. For by ἁγιάζειν our Epistle denotes the accomplishment of *the actual commencement* of the true fellowship of individuals with God, in the Covenant relation which God Himself has instituted, on the basis of the expiation wrought by the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, and in virtue of the purification obtained through the blood of Jesus Christ, under the point of view of *dedication to a Divine relationship*, ch. ix. 13 f.; x. 10, 14, 29; xiii. 12. This expression also has its origin in the terminology of the Old Testament, but has within the sphere of New Testament fulfilment and realization, a more than merely nominal and ritual significance. The Pres. Part. may stand without reference to distinction of time, in the sense of substantives (Winer), [that is, *any* Participle may, with the Article, be employed in the sense of a concrete substantive, as the Infinitive with the Art. is employed in the sense of the abstract (τὸ ἁγιά-

ζεσθαι, *the being sanctified: ὁ ἡγιασμένος, he who has been sanctified)*, while the Pres. tense denotes, according to the nature of the case, that which is going on at the time specified by the principal verb, or that which from time to time or habitually takes place. Thus οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι may denote "those who are being sanctified, or are in process of sanctification," or, "those who, from time to time, are sanctified," *i. e.*, the successive classes of the sanctified.—K.]. It is a characteristic of Christ to exercise this ministry: of us to receive its influence and efficient power. Thus we are 'from God' (John viii. 47; 1 John iv. 6), and the language can be applied to Jesus, as here the subject is the Saviour's earthly and *historical* relation to God. Hence we need not find the 'Father' in Abraham (Drus., Peirce, Beng.), nor again refer to God as *creative* (Chrys. and the Fathers), but as *spiritual* Father (Grot., Limb., *etc.*). And thus, under this connection, we need not take the words as denoting a properly universal relation (Hofm.) restricted in its application to Christ and Christians by a reference to the O. T. priesthood (Schlicht., Gerh., *etc.*). They refer *directly* to Christ and Christians.

For which reason he is not ashamed to call them brethren.—In accordance with the character of the Epistle, the author appeals not to the words of Jesus Himself regarding this his fraternal relation, but regards it as belonging essentially to the fulfilment of the Messiah's vocation; and hence, as so typified in the O. Test., that alike David the Theocratic Ruler, and Isaiah the prophetic Servant of Jehovah, recognize, feel, and express this their relation in the Church, and embrace in a unity with themselves those who otherwise are subordinated to them, and dependent upon them. In subjoining, therefore, his proof passages, the writer adds: "for which cause he is not ashamed," an expression which points on the one hand to the *distinction* between Christ's Sonship and that of believers (Chrys., Theod.); and on the other, to his sincere and hearty condescension to this fellowship, in proof of which are now given three citations from the Scripture.

VER. 12. **Saying, I will declare,** *etc.*—The first passage is from Ps. xxii. 23, according to the LXX., except that ἀπαγγελῶ is substituted for διηγήσομαι. David, amidst the sore distress of his flight from before Saul, reposes in faith, as one whom Samuel had anointed, upon the promise made to him of the throne, and declares, in the midst of affliction, not merely this assurance of deliverance and exaltation, but also his determination to declare on this account to his brethren in the congregation, to the seed of Jacob, to them that fear Jehovah, the name, the grace, the help of the Lord, and summon them to join him in praising God. We need assume neither that Christ speaks in David, nor that the Psalmist has transferred himself into the person of Christ. Nor need we interpose the *ideal* or abstract *righteous* person (Heng.) in order to justify the Messianic application of this Psalm. We can conceive it as purely typical (Hofm.), or, regarding the prophecy of history as here united with verbal prophecy, we may regard it as typi- (Del.).

The second passage is found three times in the form πεποιθὼς ἔσομαι ἐπ' αὐτῷ—**I will put my trust in him,**—so that the author has merely reversed the order of the first two words, and prefixed an emphatic ἐγώ. The passage Is. xii. 2, cannot possibly be referred to; while that 2 Sam. xxii. 3 is intrinsically suitable. Still we are not necessarily forced to this from the fact that a καὶ πάλιν separates it from the third (Is. viii. 17) as well as from the first (Ebr.). Rather we may more naturally refer it to Is. viii. 17, because the immediately following verse in Isaiah is employed as the third citation, and the separation of the two verses springs not from the author's wish to accumulate proofs (Lün.), but from the two passages presenting the relation in question under two different aspects (Del.); first, that the speaker associates himself with his brethren in a common attitude of spirit toward God, *viz.*, that of confidential trust, which belongs properly to all the children of God; secondly, that he embraces in one himself and the children that God has given him. Of course these two passages refer but typically to Jesus; but this typical view is entirely legitimate. For Isaiah, whose very name points to the Saviour, not merely prophesies with prophetic *words*, but has also begotten children who are partly pledges for the salvation of Jehovah, which is to come after affliction and through judgment, and partly, like him, point by their names symbolically to this relation, and by their position prefigure it. It is hence needless to assume (as Bl., Lün.) that the author has been led by the καὶ ἐρεῖ, introduced by the LXX. before Is. viii. 17, to suppose that the Messiah is the speaker, in that these words appeared to point to another subject than the *prophet*, who, in the whole section, has spoken in the first person, and also to another subject than God, since the latter is in the ἐπ' αὐτῷ named as He in whom the speaker puts his trust.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Angels may, indeed, sometimes be conceived as guardian spirits of individual men, and as heads of entire nations, and are also designated in Scripture as dominions, principalities, and powers, which in themselves, again, have distinctions of position, of power, and of rank. But a *dominion over the world* is never ascribed to them, neither over the world of creation, nor over that of redemption. It is, for this reason, folly to invoke them as helpers of our need, or to expect from them any saving intercession.

2. The *destination* of man to the dominion of the world, has the possibility of its realization in his *possession of the divine image*. Hence, under the dominion of sin, the *actual condition* of man cannot correspond to his Divine destination. But on account of man's susceptibility of redemption, and in reference to his future redemption, the attainment of this destination becomes the *goal* of history, and is an essential part of the Divine promises.

3. The attainment of this destination of our race, can be reached by individuals only on the *ground of redemption*, and that, too, in that *new world*, which, in its hidden ground and germ, is

already present; but in its glorified form of manifestation, is still in the future. It is linked completely, and in all respects, with the mediation of Christ as the Redeemer. But those who, through Him, have become children of God, will, by virtue of their birthright, enter into the possession of the promised land (Matth. v. 5), and of the world (Rom. iv. 13), and sitting with Him upon the throne of His glory (Matth. xix. 28), and on the seat of His Father (Rev. iii. 21, v. 10) will reign with Him as priestly kings (Rom. v. 17; 2 Tim. ii. 12), and as His saints will judge the world (1 Cor. vi. 2), and the angels (ver. 3).

4. That which for humanity is still in the future, we see in the *person of Jesus Christ* already realized. In Him the destiny of man is attained, so that in Him, idea and realization are united. An ancient voice from the synagogue (with Del., p. 59, from Biesenthal's *Rabb. Comm.*, 1857, p. 1) says: "The mystery of Adam is the mystery of the Messiah; Adam is the anagram of אדם, דוד, משיח. And the midrash at Ps. civ. 1: "God lent to Moses הוד, and to Joshua הדר in that he purposed yet, in accordance with Ps. xxi. 6, to lend both to King Messiah."

5. But precisely for this reason has also *the history of Jesus* an inestimable value. We have in it no mythological presentation of religious ideas, no symbolical expression of general relations, no moral portraiture of the ideal man, as a postulate of reason and of conscience; but, however wide-reaching may be this history, and flexible and various in its applications, it is yet in its being *matter of fact* that it has its true significance and importance. For the peculiarity of the Christian faith is not the *idea* of communion with God, and the idea of a salvation furnished by the *theanthropic* personalities and arrangements. This is rather a characteristic of all religious faith. The distinguishing feature of the Christian faith is the certainty of the realization of salvation, for eternal ages and for all believers, a realization accomplished in a single historical subject, in Jesus of Nazareth, and by the acts of His life.

6. Although men, by the fact that they live in a body of flesh and blood, hold for the time being a position subordinated to angels, as heavenly spirits, yet it is precisely in this relationship with earthly creatures, above whom men are again, by their spiritual natures, specifically exalted, that there exists the possibility of man's *central* position and of his history in his fall and redemption within the sphere of the universe. He is the *creaturely*, as Christ is the uncreated, *head of the creation.*

7. *The glorification of the body* in the future world, whose *type* and *pledge* we behold, in the Son of man, crowned with glory and honor at the right hand of the Father, and the participation of *the whole* thus glorified man, in the glory of the Lord, elevates him completely and forever above the angels. His subordination to these, is but "for a little," in respect alike of *degree* and *time.*

8. Patient endurance in our present position, in which we as yet see not the fulfilment of our destiny, and of the promises relating to it, is *rendered difficult* to us *by our sufferings*, but is *rendered easy by* the *participation* and *example of Christ.* Sufferings have been for Him no hinderance, but rather the ground and means of His glorification; hence we are not to be displeased at the sufferings which we ourselves experience, and are to take no offence at the sufferings of Jesus Christ, but in order rightly to understand and profit by them, are to have regard to their *cause* and their *purpose.*

9. A remembrance of that *crowning* of Christ which has been achieved by *sufferings*, and the declaration of the *gracious purpose* of God, in the death of Christ, *viz.*, that Christ tasted death *for us*, should, on the one hand, awaken our consciousness of guilt, on the other, strengthen our faith in the redemption already secured, and our hope of the glorification yet to be attained: for alike Christ's suffering and His coronation have sprung neither from accident, nor from any natural necessity, nor from caprice, nor from outward compulsion; but have taken place in free love, in willing obedience, according to God's gracious purpose for the accomplishment of the true end and destination of the world.

10. The final object of the world, is to reflect back the glory of God. It can fulfil this object only under the dominion of man who corresponds with his destination, *i. e.*, who mirrors in himself the glory of God. In the attainment of this, his destination, man has been hindered by sin, but sin does not merely hinder his reaching the goal; it brings him into positive destruction. Thus for the accomplishment of the world's destiny, a *deliverer* of the race becomes indispensable, who has been Himself incorporated into it, as a member, yet whose life is of such a nature, that He can work *vicariously*, and by His own progress through suffering to glory, can become the *author*, *pioneer*, and *captain* of salvation, for the children whom God leads to glory.

11. The birth and introduction of this indispensable Deliverer, is no result of mere natural development or product of the natural course of human affairs, but a work of Divine *freedom* and *love*, corresponding to the *holy nature of the Eternal and Omnipotent One*, who from everlasting to everlasting has, as to Himself and as to all things, absolute knowledge and control, and has Himself placed Himself, not merely in His *glory*, as the *end*, for the sake of which, but in His *goodness* and *might* as the *cause* by means of which, all beings are and exist. The means by which we, as redeemed ones are led to glory, *correspond*, therefore, alike to the ultimate end and the nature of Him who has both ordained the end, and arranged the *means.*

12. The fellowship which Christ has with those who are led to glory, rests, in its ultimate ground, on their *common origin* from one and the same Father. They are all *children of God*, by virtue of their *birth from God.* But this fellowship includes an essential diversity. Christ is the *eternal* Son of God, of like nature with the Father, and hence even in His state of humiliation, needs no regeneration of His nature from the corruption of sin, but only, by virtue of His true humanity, was susceptible and participant of *perfection* in the *pathway* of *suffering.* As the proper and peculiar (*ἴδιος*, Rom. viii. 32) Son of the Father He is in Himself ἅγιος (*holy*). But by

virtue of the perfection of His life in the flesh, He, as ἁγιάζων, *sanctifier*, imparts, by taking away sin and communicating His holy obedience (ch. ix. 13, 14; x. 10, 14, 29; xiii. 12) this quality to those who by adoption and regeneration receive the Divine Sonship, and acknowledges expressly the common brotherhood which He has with them preëminently on the spiritual side.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

To what shall we adhere, amidst the contradictions of our earthly life, and amidst the strifes and turmoil of the world? 1. To the *word* of God, which announces to us the truth; 2. to the *grace* of God, which works our salvation; 3. to the *Son* of God, who has become our brother.—Wherewith shall we comfort and sustain ourselves amidst the sufferings of time? 1. With hope of the *glory of the future world.* 2. With faith in the *certainty of our redemption* in Christ Jesus. 3. With the love of the *children of God.*—We shall triumph victoriously over all dangers which threaten us, if we—1, keep in our eye *our destination to that dominion over the world* which God has given us; 2, tread the *path to perfection* which God has ordained and pointed out to us; 3, allow ourselves to be led with all the children of God *in following Jesus* as the Captain of our salvation.—The greatness and power of the wondrous grace of God is most clearly discoverable by us: 1, *in the preëminence* to which in the creation He destined us above all creatures; 2, in the accomplishment of our redemption by the *giving* of His Son for us; 3, in *leading* the redeemed to sanctification, and to a perfected life in glory.—The Sonship which we possess with God is: 1, a *work of grace* which binds us to grateful acknowledgment of our unworthiness, and the Divine compassion; 2, a *state of salvation* which summons us to abiding trust in the Lord; 3, a *common brotherhood* which stimulates to mutual love in our following after Christ.—Why it is needful and good in all cases to put confidence in God the Lord: 1, because He is the God through whom, as the *Almighty*, all things are: 2, in like manner, the God for whose sake all things are, for the manifestation of His *glory;* 3, and further, the God who, as the absolutely *truthful One*, certainly executes the utterances of His lips; 4, who, as the *compassionate One*, stoops to His creatures in their necessities; 5, and as the *Holy, Ever-living, Unchangeable* God, in the only fitting way brings His purposes to accomplishment.—The way through suffering to glory is ordained for us of God: 1, *on account of our sins*, which hinder us in the promised attainment of our destiny: 2, *by the grace of God*, which will lead many children to glory; 3, *after the pattern of Jesus Christ*, who, as Captain of our salvation, was made perfect through sufferings.—From temporal sufferings spring eternal joys if they bring us: 1, under the *guidance of God;* 2, into the following of Christ; 3, into eternal glory.

STARKE:—Everything is subject to Christ, not only in this world, but also in the future. O that in true obedience of faith we may henceforth subject ourselves to Him, that we may not be obliged to bow to His chastisement as Judge!—Of the majesty and glory of Christ we must judge not according to our reason or sense, but solely according to the word of God; otherwise we shall go widely astray, 1 Cor. ii. 9.—The character of Christ's Kingdom is not worldly, but invisible and spiritual. What wonder, then, that we cannot comprehend with our senses the character of His majestic Presence and Dominion? John xviii. 36; Luke xvii. 20, 21.—As one portion of the prophecy regarding Christ is already fulfilled, *viz.*, that He should be crowned with glory and honor, we need not doubt that the rest will also be fulfilled, and that all things will be brought perfectly beneath His feet.—The grace, love and compassion of God are the source of our entire salvation; but the love of the Father was also the love of the Son, Gal. ii. 20. Observe that the expiatory death of Christ is to be for the benefit of all men, without exception, and is to be applied to them under the condition of faith, 1 Tim. ii. 6.—Precious word! The Lord Christ has tasted death for us, that we might live before Him, Rom. v. 10; Col. i. 22.—If God has taken this method with His Son, that He should be exalted by suffering, then must we also, through many tribulations, enter into eternal life, Acts xiv. 22; Christ is our "breaker," Mich. ii. 13.—Christ, the Captain of thy salvation, has been made perfect by sufferings; why, then, thou cross-shunner, wilt thou not go a like way? 1 Pet. iv. 13.—Believers are indeed brethren of Christ, on account of His human nature, but actually to bear the title and that from love is a work of the grace which they do not deserve. For He, the Brother and Head, is of far greater glory than His members.—The haughtiness of man must be put to shame before the condescension of Christ, who acknowledges us as His brethren. How unreasonable in us not to bear the shame of the poverty, or sinfulness, or impurity of our nearest friends, when Christ bears the shame of our sins!—Behold how men are honored even yet above the angels! Holy and glorious as are these latter, they are not brethren of the Son of God. Should it not arouse us to an humble, indeed, but still joyful praise of God, that we not only have Christ our Brother on the throne of the Divine Majesty, but are also ourselves with Him to be raised to the like royal dignity?—Believers are brethren of Jesus and Sons of God. What a consolation! How is it possible that they should ever be sorrowful? Rom. viii. 17.—All men are delivered over to Christ for the attainment of salvation; but happy are they who also deliver up themselves in the appropriation of it by the influence of the Holy Spirit, John vi. 44.—If Christ the Lord of Heaven and Earth is not ashamed to acknowledge us as His brethren, we also should be mindful with all diligence to maintain brotherly love among ourselves, and to evince it by words and deeds.—The exclamation, "Behold, I," expresses: 1, that the Messiah exhibits Himself as present, and, as with the finger, points to Himself: Behold, here am I! Is. xl. 5, 9; lii. 6, 7; 2, that His appearance in the flesh would be wondrous and remarkable, Is. vii. 14; ix. 5; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 3, His readiness and perfect willingness to speak, to do, and to suffer, that which had been laid upon Him, Is. L. 4, 5; Ps. xli. 7-9;

4, that it was He to whom the eyes of all Israel were to look, nay, also the heathen, Is. xlv. 22. —If it is said of Christ that He reposes His confidence in God, He is not regarded in His character as God, but as having become man, and as executing His assumed work of redemption. And this confidence involves in itself: 1, that the Messiah would exhibit Himself in a lowly, poor and unprotected condition; 2, that He would be in much suffering and danger from enemies; 3, that He would not at all times make use of His Divine power, but would surrender His life to the power of His Father; 4, that He would have abiding assurance of the Divine willingness to aid him.—It was in accordance with Divine: 1, *love*, that it should discover so effectual a means for the restoration of our lost bliss; 2, *righteousness*, that it should be such a means as should render satisfaction to righteousness itself; 3, *wisdom*, that the love and righteousness of God should, through this means, unitedly and in equal measure, distinguish themselves; 4, *truth*, in order that that which God in the Old Testament had promised at so great cost, and had prefigured in so many types, should be fulfilled, and the Head should stand, in respect to suffering, in close communion with the members; 5, *honor*, that this might thereby be most gloriously promoted.—God has done every thing which He has done for the manifestation and glorifying of His name, and this with the most entire propriety; otherwise He who possesses perfectly in Himself all glory, would have, as it were, denied Himself. Thus must the honor of God be placed as the object in all things, Ps. cxv. 1; Eph. i. 5, 6.—Believers under the Old Testament were equally with those in the New Testament, brethren of the Lord Jesus, Matth. xii. 50.

Berlenburger Bible:—Future things we must hold fast by means of the past and present. But men spring away from them and submit to no struggle. While they grasp after that which glitters, and despise the unostentatious, they wage absolutely no conflict. Many would have only glory, and would only become Lords with their Messiah; therefore they have utterly lost Christ. They would have a king in Christ, but not a bleeding priest.—What to our corrupt eyes appears abominable, is "becoming" in the eyes of God. This *becomingness* we should always study; all other *decorum*, all that otherwise belongs to well being, or is reckoned as such, our art may well let pass.—Since we have lost our case by evil doing, it must be recovered by suffering. For this leads through ways of righteousness, and yet from the impulse of love. Hence comes it that such an arrangement "became him."—We cannot come directly to holiness without expiation, but we all have equal right to both.—It is true that our humanity and Divinity constitute a pair totally unlike, yet this miserable unlikeness has awakened the compassion of God to undertake such a work on our behalf.—Had it depended on our judgment, nothing would have been accomplished in the work of redemption.—It is perhaps easily told how many elements faith has; but the thing itself costs a struggle; man, however, would gladly triumph before the victory.

Laurentius: — Divine truths in the Holy Scripture must also be experienced.—Christ's state of humiliation lasted only for a little time. —To Christ in His human nature, all things are subjected.—Whom God makes righteous, He also makes glorious. Believers have one and the same Father with Christ.

Rambach:—Believers need no visible Head, but stand immediately under Christ, ch. xii. 9. —Christ was humbled a short time below the angels: 1, in that sometimes the service of the angels was withdrawn from Him, as otherwise they are required to worship and serve Him; 2, in that He was exposed to the assaults of wicked angels; 3, in that He subjected Himself to the law which was given by angels.—In the sufferings of Christ were disclosed the grace and righteousness of God. His grace *toward us*, in laying our sin and punishment upon His Son; His righteousness *in Christ* as the surety, Rom. iii. 25.—Had Christ been a mere man, he had had absolutely no cause to be ashamed of His fellow-creatures, even though He had been elevated to the highest honor, as also Joseph was not ashamed to acknowledge his brethren, Gen. xlv. 4; in like manner, Moses, Acts vii. 22.

Steinhofer:—It is the mystery of the Divine good pleasure, that a man from our midst should be Lord on the throne of majesty, and have dominion over all things. Here none can ask, "Why doest thou so?" Here none can inquire, Why is it so determined? Why has it been so arranged, and accomplished, in Christ Jesus? But, instead, we readily bow ourselves to the earth and adore. I mean that we honor the counsel of eternity; we are astonished at the riches of grace; it is our profoundest pleasure that such is the good pleasure of God: we kiss the Son; we rejoice in this our Lord.—The lowliness and condescension of our Redeemer, the great Son of God, puts us to shame, as often as we behold Him in this form; it inspires in us pangs of love, it melts our hearts like wax before Him.—The simple look of faith toward Jesus, best learns the great mystery of the eternal purpose of God for our salvation. With this we look upon His cross, we look upon His crown. Faith grasps both together.—The grounds and causes of this entire procedure, *viz.*, that the Captain of salvation should be made perfect by death, are God's perceptions of Divine fitness and propriety.—God takes His children out of the number of the most miserable sinners.—Blessedness and glory are the two things we are to receive from our Saviour and Lord.—Jesus legitimates among His people even the name of brother, so that all worldly titles of honor readily yield to it.—It belongs to the office and work of Jesus, which is His highest joy and the delight of His heart, 1. that He gathers into a community the children of God, who have been ordained and presented to him by His Father; 2. that in His Church He announces and reveals the name of His Father; 3. that He conducts and brings His people to glory.—The way of faith has been tried by the Son of God Himself, inasmuch as Jesus is a noble and thoroughly experienced Prince and Leader on the way of faith; but the power of God is required that one maintain faith to the end.

Hahn:—If we can say with joy, Jesus is my

Lord! then we have a pass which we can and may exhibit in the whole realm of creation.—The path of suffering trod by Jesus, makes our own pleasant to us, and should repress our excessive murmuring against suffering.—From Jesus we are to learn the true spirit of suffering, and in like manner the value of suffering in the eyes of God, and with this, bethink ourselves of the brevity of suffering. We should have perpetually before our eyes, 1. the Divine sense of propriety and fitness; 2. the career Christ entered upon wholly for us; 3. the way of faith which Christ makes so honorable to us.

HILLER:—The Church is a community that treads a difficult way, but on this way is led by God; yet can enter upon it no otherwise than by blood, and by faith in one that was crucified.—The Church is a people that is forever preserved and saved by God.

RIEGER:—From the love of the Father all further revelation of the kingdom of Christ, and hope therein, is to be derived.—Of all which the result has confirmed, we can say, We see! though we may not have it directly before our eyes.—As the Saviour, under suffering, solaced Himself by this, "It takes place according as it has been decreed and written;" as He, under the heaviest assaults of terror, subjected His most pressing demand, "Is it possible?" to the, "As thou wilt!" so still more, we, in reflection on His suffering, are to rest ourselves, in this good pleasure of God, in these *Divine proprieties* which are founded in the prerogatives of God's majesty, and have an influence upon His entire kingdom.—The chief power by which the Lord Jesus endured under suffering, and looked forward to His perfection, was trust. His official burden, the weight of sin that was laid upon Him, the judgment of God, might press Him as they would; His confidence He never cast away.

HEUBNER:—The dignity of man was first brought to light by Revelation: it flows from Religion. Insignificant man becomes great by the grace of God. Toward no being has God so proved His grace as toward man, since for him He has given His Son.—Christianity knows no perfection except in union with God, and participation in His blessedness.—Christ has secured for God eternal praise, since the highest praise comes from ransomed souls.—The redemption which was completely brought about and inaugurated by the death of Christ, could become universally known and rendered efficacious, only by His exaltation. In this was demonstrated and confirmed the complete validity of His redemption.

STIER:—It was not the wrath of God, it was not condemnation that Jesus tasted, but *death;* and death, too, not on account of the wrath of God, but from the *grace of God.* Of short duration was the mockery and the shame that attended Jesus' suffering of death on our behalf; but eternal are the praise and the honor with which He is crowned.—Although Christ died for *all,* yet are not all saved by Him, but only the *many* sons who let Him draw and lead them.

STEINMEYER:—The fraternal relation sustained by the Lord to His believing ones: 1. how we have to unite this with His supreme and all-transcending dignity; 2. what an expression it should find in Christian life.

HEDINGER:—Believers are indeed brethren of Christ, on account of His human nature; but actually to bear the title is a work of that grace of which they are undeserving.

BAUMGARTEN (1856):—How looking to Jesus suffices for our happiness amidst the unhappiness of life.

FRICKE:—Suffering and victory are so little antagonistic to each other that the same being who has suffered is styled the "Captain of salvation."

[OWEN:—The Lord Christ: 1. our *head;* 2. our *only* head, *a.* of *vital influence,* *b.* of *rule* and *government;* 3. our *immediate head.*—If men *forget the true God,* and then lift up their eyes unto, or fall into the contemplation of the heavenly bodies, such is their glory, majesty, and excellency, that they will be driven and hurried unto the adoration and worship of them.—The assumption of our nature into personal union with the Son of God, was an act of mere free, sovereign, unconceivable grace.—God is more glorified in the humiliation and exaltation of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the salvation of mankind thereby, than in any of, or all the works of the first creation.—No love or grace will suit our condition but that which is incomprehensible. We find ourselves by experience to stand in need of more grace, goodness, love, and mercy, than we can look into, search to the bottom of, or fully understand.—Jesus Christ as Mediator of the New Covenant hath absolute and supreme authority given unto Him over all the works of God in heaven and on earth.—There is a double act of God's predestination; the first is His designation of some unto grace, to be sons, Eph. i. 5; the other His appointment of those sons unto glory; both to be wrought and accomplished by Christ, the Captain of their salvation.—In bringing the elect unto glory, all the sovereign acts of power, wisdom, love and grace exerted therein, are peculiarly assigned unto the Father, as all ministerial acts are unto the Son as Mediator; so that there is no reason why He may not be said, by the way of eminency, to be the ἀγωγεύς, the leader or bringer of His sons unto glory.—As the *obedience* of Christ, which is our *pattern,* did incomparably exceed whatever we can attain unto; so the *sufferings* of Christ, which are our *example,* did incomparably exceed all that we shall be called unto.—Christ is gone before us through death, and is become the "first fruits of them that sleep." And had Christ passed into heaven before He died, as did Enoch and Elijah, we had wanted the greatest evidence of our future immortality.—The Lord Jesus, being consecrated and perfected through sufferings, hath consecrated *the way of suffering,* for all that followed Him to pass through unto glory.—No end of the mediation of Christ is accomplished in them who are not sanctified and made holy.—A living head and dead members, a beautiful head and rotten members—how uncomely would it be! Such a monstrous body Christ will never own.—There is no *one thing required* of the sons of God that an unsanctified person can do: no *one thing promised them* that he can enjoy].

V.

The incarnation renders the Son of God susceptible of suffering and death, and thus fitted to become a high-priest with God, for the redemption of mankind.

Chapter II. 14–18.

14 Forasmuch then as the children are [joint] partakers of flesh and blood [*of blood and flesh*][1], he also himself likewise [in a similar manner, παραπλησίως] took part of [in] the same; that through death[2] he might destroy [bring to naught, render impo-
15 tent, καταργήσῃ] him that had [hath] the power of death, that is, the devil; And deliver them, who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.
16 For verily he took not on *him the nature of* angels [For it is not assuredly (οὐ γὰρ δή που) angels whom he rescueth (ἐπιλαμβάνεται)]; but he took on *him* [he rescueth]
17 the seed of Abraham. Wherefore [whence, ὅθεν] in all things it behooved him to be made like [to be assimilated ὁμοιωθῆναι] unto *his* brethren, that he might be [become γένηται] a merciful and faithful high priest in things *pertaining* to God, [in order] to
18 make reconciliation [propitiation] for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted [*or*, hath suffered by being himself tempted], he is able to succor them that are tempted.

[1] Ver. 14.—Instead of the common σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος, *flesh and blood*, we are to read here, according to A. B. C. D. E. Uffenbach, Itala, Vulg. αἵματος καὶ σαρκός, as at Eph. vi. 12.

[2] Ver. 14.—The Cod. Clarom. reads ἵνα διὰ τοῦ θανάτου θάνατον καταργήσῃ, τὸν τὸ κράτος κτλ. [But the θάνατον is an evident interpolation, probably the result of carelessness in copying.—K.].

[Ver. 14.—ἐπεὶ οὖν, *since, inasmuch then.*—κεκοινώνηκεν, *have participated, and still participate*, the perfect marking the permanent condition, in contrast with the Aor. μετέσχεν, *took part in, participated in*, as a historical act.—παραπλησίως, *similarly, in like manner.*—τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα, *the one having*—him who was having, who *had*, or, him who is having, who *has*. It is better here to take the participle as describing a general and abiding attribute of the devil, *him who has, etc.*, the Potentate of Death.

Ver. 15.—τούτους ὅσοι. Eng. ver., *them that*. This rendering does not quite adequately represent the original, which is—*these, these persons, as many as*, describing mortals who, as a class, are victims of death.—τοῦ ζῆν—τοῦ βίου, but used here, doubtless, in sharper antithesis to θάνατος.—ἔνοχοι δουλείας, *held under, obnoxious to, bondage*. Matth. v. 22, ἔνοχος τῇ κρίσει, *held under, obnoxious, liable to the judgment*, scarcely adequately rendered by *in danger of*. Matth. xxvi. 66, ἔνοχος τοῦ θανάτου, *liable to death*; Eng. ver. *guilty of death*.

Ver. 16.—οὐ γὰρ δήπου, *for not you see doubtless*, πού, *I suppose, perhaps*, softening δή—ἀγγέλων without art, as a class, and emphatic in its position before the verb—for not, indeed, is it *angels* whom he rescues, *etc.*—ἐπιλαμβάνεται, not as Eng. ver., "to take on him the nature," but "*to lay hold upon for succor, to rescue*." The former; once the prevailing rendering but it is now generally rejected. See Moll's note. Ἐπί has reference not to the *subject* of the verb, but to its *object*, "to lay hold *upon*."

Ver. 17.—ὁμοιόω, *to make like, to assimilate*; ὁμοιωθῆναι, *to be made like, to be assimilated.*—ἵνα γένηται, *that he might* (strictly, *may*) *become*, not *be*, as so often in Eng. ver.

Ver. 18.—May be very variously rendered, as "for being himself tempted in that wherein he hath suffered;" or, "being tempted in that wherein he hath himself suffered," *etc.* Moll renders, "For in how far he hath suffered as one that was himself tempted." The rendering of the Eng. ver. is, perhaps, as good as any. See note below.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 14. **Since, therefore, the children have common share in flesh and blood.**—Share, *i. e.*, not with their ancestors (Volkmar), but with one another. The children (παιδία) are those mentioned in the verse preceding, who possess not merely a common spiritual nature from a like divine source, but, as real men, have a common earthly nature, which, as is customary, is designated by its two leading sensuous constituents—flesh and blood; the *blood*, however, being first mentioned with a half latent reference, probably, to the subsequently-mentioned atoning death of the Redeemer. The connectives, ἐπεὶ οὖν, however, show that the link of connection is by no means the mere word "children" (Hofm.); while, on the other hand, there is no ground for Lünemann's assertion, springing from the false idea that vv. 11–18 are merely incidental, and that ver. 14 returns to the main thought in ver. 10—that οὖν, while *grammatically* belonging to the protasis, "since the children," *etc.*, belongs, *logically*, to the apodosis, "he himself took part," *etc.* The clause with ἐπεί, rather, keeping before our eye the *constant* principle of natural relationship (partaker of flesh and blood) carries us over from the typical relation, *by no means incidentally touched*, to the relation which exists in Christ; the οὖν, showing that the thought is regarded as inferential, inasmuch as it is a fact (the author would say), that the "children"—not children generally, but the children in ques-

tion—are not ideal forms, but actual men, it follows that the *incarnation* of the Son of God, which renders Him susceptible of suffering, is the appropriate and essential means for attaining the divine purpose of transferring, by means of redemption, men, become subjects of bondage, into a true filial relation to God.

2. **He also himself, in like manner, took part in the same.**—The aor., *μετέσχεν*, points to the assuming of human nature as a thing belonging absolutely to the past, while the perf. *κεκοινώνηκεν* indicates the *permanent condition* springing from the act of *κοινωνεῖν* (here having its regular classical construction with the Gen.) Παραπλησίως is certainly not a weakened *ὁμοίως;* for the author says, ver. 17, *κατὰ πάντα* (Hofm., Del.); and he holds to no mere *analogy* of the life of Jesus to a real human life, or a general similarity in some individual points, generating a *quasi* kindred relation. His object is rather to assert the *true and complete humanity* of the Son of God. But the adv. is not, therefore, with de Wette, to be rendered "in like manner," nor with Bleek, "in equal measure;" but expresses at once the actual approximation, and yet the never-to-be-forgotten or overleaped distinction of Jesus Christ, from all other men, as at Rom. viii. 3; Phil. ii. 7. Ὁ *λόγος οἱονεὶ σάρξ γίνεται.* Orig. c. *Cels.*, IV., 15.

That by means of death he might destroy him, *etc.*—The doing away of death in the kingdom of the Messiah, is matter of prophecy, Is. xxv. 8; Hos. xiii. 14; Dan. xii. 2, 3. Κράτος *τοῦ θανάτου* is not the power of putting to death, which belongs to God alone. Nor is *κράτος* to be taken absolutely, nor *τοῦ θανάτου* as Gen. Subj. (Ebr.) with the too artificial and far-fetched thought that the phrase refers to the tyrannical dominion of death (1 Cor. xv. 5, 6), which, by means of original sin, the devil has obtained and perpetually exercises, Wis. ii. 24; Rom. v. 12. "He holds this dominion not as a Lord, but as an executioner" (Quenstädt). The expression may, perhaps, with Thol., be explained from the author's blending the idea of Death and of *Hades*, both together personified as Rulers (Rev. i. 8, 6; viii. 20, 14), and representing the devil at the same time as Lord of Hades, of whose keys the Redeemer has obtained possession (Rev. i. 18). At all events the "devil" is not here identical with the angel of death (who is not in Jewish *Angelology* confounded with Sammael), but he is the murderer of men, *ἀνθρωποκτόνος*, from the beginning (John viii. 44), whose dominion stands in essential and causative connection with all death (Del.). "The *will* of Satan is always unjust, his power never! for his will he has from himself, his power from God." (Greg. Magn *at Job* I. 11). *Καταργεῖν* with the classics=*to render impotent*, is employed by Paul for the complete putting down of hostile powers (1 Cor. xv. 24), and specially of death (1 Cor. xv. 26; 2 Tim. i. 10). The word occurs with Paul twenty-eight times, elsewhere in the New Testament only here and Luke xiii. 7. It stands Ezra iv. 21, 23; v. 5; vi. 8, as rendering of the Aramæan בַּטִּל. *Substantial* parallels in thought, are found Gen. iii. 15; Is. xxv. 8; 1 Jno. iii. 8. *Θανάτου* is not to be specialized by supplying *αὐτοῦ*, *his* death. This would mar the thought which is correctly given by Primasius: "*Arma quæ fuerunt illi quondam fortia adversus mundum, hoc est mors, per eam Christus illum percussit, sicut David, abstracto gladio Goliæ, in eo caput illius amputavit, in quo quondam victor ille solebat fieri.*" "It is death *itself, and as such*, which Jesus has made the means of annihilating the ruler of death. In the person of Jesus there has commenced a life of humanity, which triumphs over the deadly power of Satan, after this power had brought that life (a life of blood and flesh similar to ours), in which Jesus becomes subjected to it, into a death which has rather proved the *death of death*" (Hofm., *Schriftb.*, II., 1, p. 274).

Ver. 15. **And deliver those who—were subject to bondage.**—The discussion proceeds now to designate the *subjects* of the incarnation and death of Christ. These great acts have reference not to beings exempt from death, but to beings who are held under bondage to the fear of death (Del.). It is mankind, as a class, strikingly characterized by this language, as distinguished from angels or demons, that are the objects of redemption. The *limitation* is expressed by the prefixed *τούτους*, *these*, while the subjoined *ὅσοι*, *as many as*, *whosoever*, intimates that within the sphere of this limitation, the totality of the members of the class are included. *Grammatically δουλείας* might be constructed with *ἀπαλλάξῃ*, and *φόβῳ* with *ἔνοχοι*, as by Böhme and Abresch, inasmuch as *ἔνοχος* may be equally well constructed with the Dat. as with the Gen. But the position of the words is adverse to this construction. [The rendering then would be, "and deliver those as many as, through their whole life, were held under the fear of death, from bondage." This gives to *ἀπαλλάξῃ* such a Gen. as might very naturally follow it, instead of leaving it to stand absolutely; but on the other hand, Alf. following Bleek, remarks that *ἔνοχοι* with the Gen. has rather the force of a noun *the subjects* of; with the Dat. that of a participle, *liable to*, and therefore would here be better conjoined with the *δουλείας*, "subjects of bondage," than with the *φόβῳ θαν.*—On the whole, the ordinary construction seems preferable.—K.]. "*Φόβος* and *δοῦλος* are interchangeable ideas (Rom. viii. 15), as fear of death, and consciousness of guilt; when the latter is removed, comes in childlike *boldness* (*παῤῥησία*), and the state of *bondage* has disappeared." (Thol.).

Ver. 16. **For it is not assuredly angels whom he,** *etc.*—The correct interpretation of *ἐπιλαμβ. τινος* (=to lay hold of one in order to secure him for oneself, here, *to lay hold of in aid, to succor*), was, according to Thol., first expressed by Castellio in his translation, 1551, and stigmatized by Beza as *execranda audacia.* The whole ancient Church, followed by Erasm. and the Reformers, in the 17 cent. the Reformed Moresius and the Luth. Scherzer, Calov, Seb. Schmidt and Chr. Wolf, explained it erroneously of *the assumption of human nature;* Camero defended the correct rendering in the most thorough manner; the Socinians (except Socinus himself) immediately accepted it; the Catholic Ribera (1606) chose rather to confess that he did not

understand Paul than reject the interpretation of so many Fathers, and even Rich. Simon censured the admission of the change into the version of the Port Royal. Ebrard also overlooks the Pres. tense, and the δήπου (='I think,' 'I should suppose;' or, 'surely perhaps,' 'surely I suppose,' HART, *Partikellehre*, I., p. 285), and thinks (as did formerly Hofm.) that the author appeals to the well-known fact that God entered not with angels into a gracious covenant relation, but with the seed of Abraham. But the train of thought by no means suggests (as πον in ver. 6) any special passage of the Old Testament, although the erroneous *nusquam* of the Vulgate has been followed by Luther and many early expositors. Nor is the *Present* to be understood as pointing to an *ever* ready help of a general character, but to the aid which Christ renders in redemption, and which is as such perpetually existing. Bleek, de Wette and Lün. assume a discrepancy between this passage and Col. i. 20; but with no good reason. For the special and exclusive objects of redemption are *men of flesh and blood*, not purely spiritual beings; while among them the angels have no *need*, and the devil is *incapable* of redemption. The absence of the article shows that not individuals are spoken of, but classes. The expression 'seed of Abraham,' however, neither, on the one hand, contradicts Paul's wider statement of the purpose of the Gospel (although, as de Wette justly remarks, Paul would not have thus expressed himself, and hence the language is not to be explained purely from the nationality of the reader), nor, on the other, as we look at the terms τοῦ λαοῦ, *of the people*, ver. 17, and τὸν λαόν, *the people*, ch. xiii.12, are we at liberty to take the expression for a designation of mankind in its *spiritual relation* (as believers are called "the seed of Abraham') as is maintained by Bengel, Böhme, Klee, Stier, Wieseler. The term rather proceeds upon and suggests the view, so familiar to the Hebrews, that the whole redemptive and religious history of humanity has its central point in the seed of Abraham. "As in the purpose of God respecting the sending of Christ, so in His purpose respecting salvation in Christ, and in respect of their relation to other nations, the Israelites have a certain priority, not to say, superiority. It is only because the moral conditions have remained unfulfilled by them, that salvation has been taken from them. But the compassion of God, which embraces *all*, will, therefore, yet again extend itself to them." (KLUGE). Fricke gives too narrow an application of the words, when he explains them of the "Believers of all nations." To make with Dav. Schulz, *death*, (ὁ θάνατος) subject of the verb: "for death lays not hold of angels," makes an entirely different construction, grammatically, indeed, admissible, but logically untenable, since ver. 17 stands closely connected with ver. 16, and Christ is the natural subject of ver. 17, as well as of vv. 14, 15 (Lün.). To this view, moreover, the term 'seed of Abraham,' is in no way adapted. Ebrard rightly remarks that ver. 17 so repeats the thought already expressed, that at the same time a new perspective opens, *viz.*, a glance at the thought that Christ is not merely the most perfect organ of God's revelation to man, not merely a messenger of God elevated above all messengers and angels, even above the angel of Jehovah, but that he is at the same time the perfect high-priestly representative of humanity in its relation to God.

VER. 17. **Whence it behooved him in all things to be assimilated to his brethren.**—The un-Pauline ὅθεν (but frequent in our Epistle, and found also in Acts xxvi. 19), deduces from the *purpose* of Christ's incarnation given ver. 16, the *obligation* which that purpose involved: for ὤφειλεν denotes the obligation springing from the *object which was undertaken*, as ἔδει would have shown the necessity as matter of *purpose and decree* (Luke xxiv. 26), and ἔπρεπεν as matter of *intrinsic fitness and propriety* (ver. 10). Ὁμοιωθῆναι in a kindred sense, Acts xiv. 11. The idea of likeness is emphasized by Lünemann.

That he might become a merciful and faithful high-priest in things pertaining to God.—The order of the words seems to favor the rendering of LUTH.: "that he might become compassionate and a faithful high-priest," *etc.*, favored also by Grot., Böhm., Bl., de W., Stein, Thol., Lün. But the ἵνα γένηται, *that he might become*, declares assuredly what Jesus, when thus assimilated to humanity, was to become, and in this connection the declaration that He was to *become* compassionate, might suggest the idea that He previously was not so. [Yet to this it might be replied that γίγνομαι implies frequently, not absolutely *to become*, but *to prove ones-self*, as Rom. iii. 4.—K.]. True, the author has hitherto emphasized rather the *arrangement of God* in the work of salvation, than the self-devotion of the Saviour; yet from the preceding it is still clear enough that the incarnation originated in compassion toward men exercised equally on the part of Him who submitted himself to it (Del.). On the contrary, the thought is entirely pertinent that the Incarnate One is, as such, to *become a high-priest*, in whom *the two characteristics essential to this calling*, expressing His proper relation alike to man ('compassionate') and to God ('faithful') come forth into view in the actual conduct and experiences of His life. Bengel followed by Cram., Storr, Ebr., Hofm., Del., remarks, in regard to the inversion of the words, that ἐλεήμων (the *compassionate* element having received sufficient prominence) recedes into the background, while the *faithful high-priest* (πιστ. ἀρχιερ.), with its two-fold conception, yet to be unfolded, takes the foreground of the picture. The adverbial phrase τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, *in things pertaining to God*, belongs not merely to πιστός (Klee), or ἀρχιερεύς (Bl.), but qualifies the entire statement. Nor does πιστός denote *reliableness*, but, as shown ch. iii. 2, *fidelity* in the work He has undertaken. And utterly without ground is the statement of de Wette, that the idea of ἀρχιερεύς comes in abruptly, with nothing preceding to pave the way for it. For the mention of purification from sin (i. 3), of sanctification (ii. 11), of saving mediation (ii. 16), of the death of Christ as a death on behalf of men (ii. 9), is a sufficient preparation, apart from the immediately following account of the functions to which he was appointed.

To make expiation for the sins of the people.—In the classics ἱλάσκεσθαί τινα appears

only in the sense of *propitiating some one*, of which propitiation Deity or even men may be objects, but never inanimate things. But neither the LXX. nor the N. T. use the term of any process of rendering Jehovah *graciously disposed;* but employ it either of the independent gracious determination of God in which the Pass. and Mid. signification run into each other, or, disregarding its reflex middle force, they apply it to one who performs an act, the object of which is *sin*, and the effect of which is that sin shall cease to awaken God's wrath toward men. The LXX. construct ἱλάσκεσθαι with the Dat. of the person or thing for which propitiation is sought =*propitium fieri;* ἐξιλάσκ., on the contrary, frequently with the Acc., or, with περί of the person to be atoned for=*expiare*. It is true that in regard to man's relation to man we find ἐξιλάσκεσθαι τὸ πρόσωπόν τινος, Gen. xxxiii. 20, and θυμόν, Prov. xvi. 4. But no where, not even 2 Sam xxi. 3, does God or His wrath appear as object of ἐξιλ., but *sin*, 1 Sam. iii. 14. Expiation interposes between wrath and sin, so that the latter is covered over, Num. xvii. 11 ff. Christ, then, is a propitiation for our sins (ἱλασμὸς περὶ τ. ἁμ. ἡμῶν, 1 John ii. 2; iv. 10), and appointed by God as our ἱλαστήριον, Rom. iii. 25. As this expiation refers objectively to the sins of the whole world (1 John ii. 2), τοῦ λαοῦ is employed under the point of view before designated. Del. misconceives the reference of the term in explaining: "He officiates now as high-priest amidst a ransomed Church, which, in the O. T., is called *the People*, *i. e.*, the people of God; and what, as propitiating high-priest, He accomplishes, is designed to prevent the sin still adhering to His Church from marring the loving and gracious relation which has been once for all established."

VER. 18. **For in that he himself hath suffered**, *etc.*—The language alludes not to the efficacy of the sufferings of Christ as rendering satisfaction to the Divine law, and thus as the *meritorious* ground of His Priesthood (Hofm.), but (with Del.), to the *moral* fitness which these sufferings gave Him for the office. And it is not barely in the circumstance that Christ has *suffered*, but in the relation of these sufferings to His personal *character*, as one who has been subjected to actual temptations, that we recognize His capacity to aid all who are from time to time exposed to temptations. (Observe the force of the Present Participle). The rendering, "Wherein," or, "in the sphere in which" (Luth., Bl., Ebr., and others), restricts His power to the too narrow sphere of *like* circumstances, of suffering and temptation (Lün.). Ἐν ᾧ is to be resolved into ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι, *in this thing that, on the ground that, in so far as*, or, *since* (BERNH. *Synt.*, p. 211). [It may be doubted if ἐν ᾧ ever meant strictly and in itself *since*, or *because*, but it undoubtedly may have the force of *in this that=in the fact that*, hence nearly=*on the ground that*. Thus it may be resolved either into *wherein* (in the sphere in which), or *in that* (on the ground that). There is, *in fact*, here, I think, but little difference; for the rendering "wherein, in the sphere in which," is in reality only *apparently* more restricted than the other. Because if the personal suffering of Christ is a necessary condition of His sympathizing succor, then the *extent* of His temptations and sufferings must be really the measure of His ability to render sympathy and succor; so that to say, "*wherein* He hath suffered He is able," and "*in that* He hath suffered He is able," amount *practically* to the same thing. If He could not sympathize and succor only *in that* He had suffered, then He can sympathize and succor only *wherein* He has suffered. Aside from this, the passage may be variously rendered. It may be resolved in several different ways, according as we take ἐν ᾧ as *in that*, or *wherein*, and according as we connect αὐτός with πέπονθεν, or πειρασθείς. The principal are these:—

1. "In that (because) He hath Himself suffered, being tempted, He is able," *etc.*
2. "Wherein He hath Himself suffered, being tempted, He is able," *etc.*
3. "In that He hath suffered, being Himself tempted."
4. "Wherein He hath suffered, being Himself tempted."
5. "Being tempted in that He hath Himself suffered."
6. "Being tempted wherein He hath Himself suffered."
7. "Being Himself tempted in that He hath suffered."
8. "Being Himself tempted wherein He hath suffered."

Of these the English Ver. and Bib. Union adopt the first; Delitzsch adopts substantially the seventh; Alford, substantially, with Ebrard, the eighth (having been Himself tempted in that which He hath suffered); Moll substantially the third. Fortunately it makes little difference as to the main sense which construction we adopt, and among them all I prefer the first or second as the more obvious and simple, although the construction adopted by Alford is nearly or quite unobjectionable.—K.].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. "The children of God, allied in their dispositions to the Son of God, have become in need of *succor* (ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι), of *assistance* (βοήθεια). This redemption, however, is the result of no determination formed in time, after the occurrence of the Fall, but an eternal purpose of God simultaneous with His purpose to create man (Eph. i. 4; 2 Tim. i. 9; Rom. xvi. 25; 1 Pet. i. 20). The idea of the perfect God-man had thus of necessity to *actualize* itself, for the salvation of the children of God who were to be led to their goal.—The Redeemer was of necessity to become a member in the diseased organism of humanity, to assume humanity with its susceptibility to suffering, only without sin, iv. 15. The end and goal was the *overcoming of death*" (Thol.).

2. That *Divine help* which has been bestowed in Christ, and is being continually bestowed, relates, not to the removal of outward sufferings as such, but relates directly to human sufferings in so far as they are either *judicial consequences of sin*, as well of that of the race as of that of the person, or in so far as they have a character

which *tempts to sin*. The aid, therefore, rendered to humanity has as well an *ethical* as a *soteriological* significance.

3. In order to become for us the true, all-sufficient and actual Saviour, the eternal Son of God has entered not merely into a fellowship with us of internal and spiritual life, but *into a participation alike in respect of nature and of race, in our outward and historic life*. As, however, He has not, by this entrance into the fraternal relation, impaired His Divinity, there remains to be acknowledged a distinction never to be done away between His and our nature—a distinction having its ultimate ground partly in our *creatureliness*, partly in our *sinfulness*. Under the restrictions imposed by this distinction, human nature has, in its *full extent*, been made historically His nature, and an actual *nearness to God*, in a living and personal form, has been thereby imparted to the race.

4. The actual human nature of Jesus Christ renders possible His susceptibility of *suffering and death*, and this again conditions that perfect *carrying out of His high-priestly calling*, which is the *means* of accomplishing that salvation, for the sake of which the eternal Son of God has become man. "On account of the love which He bare to us, Jesus Christ our Lord has shed His blood for us according to the will of God, and given His flesh for our flesh, and His soul for our soul" (Clem. Rom. 1 Cor. xlix.).

5. Death and sin spring from one common root. Both involve in their essence a separation, a rupture, so to speak, in contravention of the Divine purpose, and have their origin in a sundering of the creature's fellowship with God. But *death* is the revelation or laying bare of this state of things in the form of punishment, and as a consequence of God's previously threatened judgment. *Sin*, on the contrary, is the voluntary and willing movement of man in the relation of estrangement from God. Precisely for this reason can the *fear of death* be predicated of sinners, and the *power of death* be predicated of Satan; and from both of these Christ alone is able to redeem us, in that He identifies Himself with humanity in its nature, its sufferings, its temptations, yet without sin, and offers up His holy life as an expiation for sin. It is at the same time clear from this how God, as Creator and Judge of the world, can directly and positively take part in the *death* of man, but not in his sinfulness; while the devil is at the same time the author of sin, and the tempter and the murderer of man.

6. Death, which, under the influences of sin, is the essential means of our enslavement by Satan, became in Christ *the essential means of our deliverance*. "The devil, as he who had the power of death, delighted in death; and that in which he delighted, the Lord held out to him. Thus His cross became a snare for the devil" (AUGUSTINE *Sermons*, 263). "The Scripture has announced this, *viz.*, that one death devoured the other (1 Cor. xv. 54): death has been turned into derision. Hallelujah!" (LUTH. *Easter Hymn* of year 1524). *Dominus itaque noster ad humani generis redemptionem veniens velut quemdam de se in necem diaboli hamum fecit. Hujus hami linea illa est per evangelium antiquorum patrum propago memorata—in cujus extremo incarnatus Dominus id est hamus ista ligaretur—Hamus hic raptoris fauces tenuit et se mordentem momordit.—Ibi quippe inerat humanitas, quæ ad se devoratorem adduceret; Ibi divinitas, quæ perforaret; ibi aperta infirmitas, quæ provocaret; ibi occulta virtus quæ raptoris faucem transfigeret*" (GREGOR. MAGN. *ad Job*. xl. 19).*

7. The death of the God-man, who despoiled Satan of his power, is neither a merely passive enduring of hostile assaults of man or of Satan, nor a merely active surrendering of Himself to the conflict. It is neither a bare punishment of sin, called forth by the wrath of God, nor an exclusive attestation of Christ's moral power of will, under the aspects of trust in God, fidelity to His calling, and fulfilment of His obligation. It unites inseparably in itself moral and religious features; presents the active and the passive elements which enter into it, as perfectly and mutually interpenetrating each other, and can be rightly understood only as belonging to a historically developed *scheme of salvation*. Being in its import a *sacrificial death* for the expiation of sin, it presupposes the *perfecting of the life* of the God-man by active obedience; has the *reconciliation* of the world with God as its consequence; and is in its nature *vicarious*, or substitutionary, by means of suffering obedience.

8. Deliverance from the fear of death is wrought not by a new doctrine of immortality, which changes our conceptions of the future world, but by our *transition into a new relation*, in which the sting of death, the wounding, rankling consciousness of guilt is removed, (1 Cor. xv. 17, 55). Christ is the Prince of Life (Acts iii. 15), who conquers death and Hades, and secures for us both the knowledge and possession of life, (2 Tim. i. 10; John v. 24; xi. 25; xiv. 19), who not only holds in his hands the keys of Death and of Hades, (Rev. i. 18; xx. 14; xxi. 4); but by His resurrection has begotten believers by a lively hope, (1 Peter i. 3, 4); produces in them the certainty of a glorious resurrection and eternal life, Rom. v. 21; vi. 23; and Himself brings this life at His glorious appearing, John xvii. 10; Col. iii. 3; Phil. iii. 21, in that His Spirit creates in believers, first a spiritual and then a bodily renovation, Rom. viii. 11. "The death of Christ has become, as it were, a root of life, an annihilation of corruption, a doing away of sin, and an end of wrath. We were laden with a curse, and in Adam had been brought under the sentence of death. But since the Word that knew no sin, made Himself to be called a Son of Adam, and the debts incurred by the first transgression have been cancelled by Him, human nature has in Christ been manifestly restored to soundness, and this His sinlessness has delivered the dwellers upon the earth."—(CYRILL. ALEX.).

9. There is an old controversy whether the au-

* ["And thus our Lord coming for the redemption of the human race, made, as it were, a sort of hook of Himself for the destruction of the devil. The line of this hook is the succession of Ancient Fathers recorded in the Gospel . . . . at whose extremity this hook, an incarnate God, should be fastened. . . . . This hook held the jaws of the spoiler and consumed him who was consuming itself. Because there was a humanity which should attract to itself the devourer; there a Divinity which should pierce him; there was an open infirmity which might challenge his approach; there a concealed power which should transfix the jaws of the spoiler"].

thor makes the *high-priestly* office of Christ commence with His return to the Father, (Schlicht., Griesb., Schultz, Bl.) so that, as maintained by the Socinians, His High-priesthood coincides in origin essentially with His sovereignty, and His death on the cross corresponds not to the offering, but only to the slaughtering of the victim; or whether in our epistle Christ's offering of Himself on the cross is regarded as the proper High-priestly act (WINZER *de Sacerdotis officio quod Christo tribuitur, comm.* I. 1825, and nearly all recent writers). In favor of the latter view we may urge that the author places the voluntary offering of Jesus Christ, and His entrance with His own blood, into the heavenly sanctuary, regarded as two inseparable parts of the same transaction, on a parallel with the well-known Jewish rite, and that the expiation of the sins of men is referred to the sacrificial death of Christ, ii. 14; vii. 27; ix. 11–14, 26, 28; x. 10; xii. 14; xiii. 12. The unquestionable emphasis laid on the *heavenly* character of Christ's high-priesthood, is explained from the author's design to set forth the higher and unconditioned excellence of the Christian high-priest, in contrast with those who exercised their priestly function on earth, in the typical sanctuary at Jerusalem. The intercession on behalf of men, which is made in the presence of God by the transcendently exalted Redeemer, is but the continued exercise of a high-priestly office, upon which He had already entered. (Lün.) The scene which transpired with the sin offerings in the outer court on the great day of atonement, finds its perfect counterpart and realization in *Christ's offering* of Himself once for all on earth. *Between* the slaughter of the victim in the outer court, and the sacrifice on the altar of the outer court, took place that act of solemn significance, the carrying of the blood into the Holiest of all; and of *this* act the antitype and fulfilment takes place exclusively in heaven. (Del.)

10. From that moral decision which, in the grand crisis of life, determines its *entire direction*, and with this its collective destiny, we are to distinguish partly those moral decisions made *upon the basis* of this, and running through the whole life, and partly those acts of will which *precede and prepare for* this capital decision. So also the *trials* appointed by God, are not to be confounded with the *temptations* wrought by Satan, although both may concur in the same circumstances, and by this concurrence prove doubly dangerous. Especially do *sufferings* bear this two-fold character.

11. In all these relations Jesus has been assimilated to us, and in the most various situations and forms, has subjected Himself, according to the will of God, to *personal and actual* temptations, only with the distinguishing trait that sin has neither potentially nor actually shown itself in Him, and hence there were to be overcome in His person no conditions of corruption, and no proper lustful impulses (Jas. i. 14). Precisely for this reason has He become a second Adam, the founder, in the old race of sinners, of a new race of children of God.

12. *The existence and the agency of the devil* are, according to the tenor of the doctrine of this epistle, as well as of Scripture elsewhere, to be recognized as real, and his agency is to be conceived as consisting in temptation to sin, and in bringing sinners into bondage to death, in the Biblical sense of this word—a sense in which are united natural, spiritual and eternal death. But this agency of the devil, Christ victoriously encounters, a succorer of those who are tempted, and a deliverer from the deadly dominion of the devil. The means of achieving this result are found in His temptations and His sufferings, by which He Himself was perfected for glory.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Christ became man 1. as to nature and quality in real assumption of our flesh and blood; 2. as to *purpose*, in order to become susceptible to suffering, temptation and death; 3. as to final *object*, in order to ransom us from the power of sin, of death, and of the devil.—The death of Jesus Christ is to be regarded 1. as the proof of His true humanity, and of His divine love; 2. as the end of His sufferings; 3. as the culminating point of His temptations; 4. as the instrument of His victory; 5. as the means of our redemption.—Our redemption is a work of God's grace for our salvation; for it is 1. a breaking of the power *a.* of sin, *b.* of death, *c.* of the devil; 2. a redemption by the sinless yielding up of the Son of God into the fellowship *a.* of our nature, *b.* of our temptations, *c.* of our sufferings; 3. a deliverance into the fellowship, *a.* of divine sonship, *b.* of triumph over the world, *c.* of a perfected and glorified life.—The expiation of the sins of the people reminds us; 1. of the prevailing, *a.* bodily, *b.* spiritual corruption of our race; 2. of our pressing, *a.* universal, and *b.* personal indebtedness of guilt; 3. of God's righteous, *a.* present, *b.* future retribution; 4. of the ever ready succor of Jesus Christ as the *a.* compassionate, *b.* faithful high-priest with God; 5. of that fellowship *a.* with God, *b.* with the children of God, which binds us to the imitation of Jesus.—Wherein, amidst all our lowliness, consists the preëminence of our race above the angels? 1. we are fallen, but not necessarily lost; 2. we can suffer, but by triumphing over sin, have precisely herein fellowship with Christ; 3. we must die, but are able in death to attain to a higher stage of life.—Whither are we to look in sufferings and temptations?—1. To the *peril* which threatens us, *a.* in the heaviness of the assault, by the union of sufferings and temptations; *b.* on account of the origin of our temptations, in the agency of the devil; *c.* in respect of the consequences of our succumbing, by which we are more ignominiously enslaved; 2. to the *weakness* which cleaves to us, and *a.* brings to light our connection with sin, *b.* makes us sensible of our natural helplessness, *c.* awakens, intensifies and guides our healthful longing after the deliverer; 3. to the *succor* which we can obtain in Christ, *a.* as the Son of God, who has become like to us men, *b.* who has suffered as one that was tempted, *c.* but by death has wrested his dominion from the devil.—In Christ Jesus is imparted to us genuine divine help: since 1. His *incarnation* shows that the purpose of God to render us His children, God Himself adheres to; 2. His *struggle with temptation* shows the possibility of a victory

over sin; 3. His *suffering of death*, as the compassionate and faithful high priest, effects, on our behalf, the expiation of our sins, and the overthrow of the dominion of the devil.—Our Christian obligation demands, 1. that we do not fear death and the devil; 2. that we avoid sin; 3. that we take Christ as our helper in our temporal and spiritual needs.—To the greatness of our *misery* corresponds the greatness of our *guilt*, and also the greatness of the divine *compassion and faithfulness* in Christ.—*Suffering* presses heavily; more heavily *temptation;* most heavily *guilt:* but Christ assists us to *bear* suffering, to *overcome* temptation, to obliterate and *wipe out* guilt.—Our text places in contrast before us the *worst enemy* and the *best friend;* the greatest *weakness* and the mightiest *strength;* the bitterest *misery*, and the surest, nearest and sweetest *aid.*—Christ has become, in all respects, like us, and yet remained exalted infinitely above us, whether we look 1. at His *person*, or 2, at His *walk*, or 3, at His *final withdrawal* from His temporal life.

STARKE:—The devil has dominion and power over men in respect of natural, spiritual and eternal death. For after having plunged the human race by sin into spiritual death, he naturally so rules over it by sin, that by spiritual death he holds it captive, and by the natural death which thence results, leads it on to death eternal.—The power of death is ever-during fear, terror, distress, trembling and quivering before the stern judgment of God, by which the soul of man is tormented, so that it ever dies, and yet never dies, because it is immortal. This power the devil possesses; that is, he tortures and afflicts the conscience with hellish fear and terror, trembling and dismay. Satan is appointed by God as His executioner, His jailor, or, if one may so say, an executor of the curse of the law, who is authorized to demand man for deserved punishment, and to proceed against him before the court, by virtue of the claim of the law, so that God cannot, without infringing upon His righteousness, reject his demand, which is the demand of the law itself (Is. xlix. 24; Matth. xii. 29; Rev. xii. 10).—Christ is the sweet antidote to the bitterness of death.—No hero is naturally so bold that he is not terrified at death. But believers in Christ are such valiant heroes, that even death they do not fear nor even taste (John viii. 51).—The law does right in disclosing to thee thy sins; but when it would condemn thee, then against law, sin, and death, appears thy Saviour, and says: I am also of flesh and blood, and they are my brethren and sisters; for what they have done I have paid the reckoning. Law, wilt thou condemn them? condemn me. Sin, wilt thou pierce and slay? pierce thou me. Death, wilt thou swallow up and devour? devour thou me. The condition of servitude is set over against that of Sonship, and is connected with a torturing fear of death, since we find ourselves so controlled by sin, and the dominion of Satan, that our own powers can never emancipate us (John viii. 34); and this servitude is far heavier than that servitude of the Old Testament under the law and Levitical ordinances, which was rather analogous to a state of minority and pupilage (Gal. iv. 1-5). But the redemption wrought through Christ offers a freedom of such a nature, that we emerge by it out of all bondage and slavish fear, into true Sonship, and serve God with willing and joyful spirit, in all truth and purity. For as, by the work of regeneration, it brings to the soul spiritual life, so natural death loses its terror, and is converted into a blessing, Luke i. 74, 75; Rom. viii. 15; Gal. v. 1; 1 John iv. 18.—The fallen angels have no redemption to hope for, Matth. xxv. 41, 46.—The qualities of a true high-priest are compassion and fidelity; both these Christ must possess from His likeness to us. 1. Compassion is, indeed, a Divine attribute which existed in the Son of God before He became man. But as He has taken upon Himself our nature, He has Himself an actual personal perception and sense of our wretchedness. No one knows the spirit of the poor and sick like Him who has Himself been sick and poor. 2. From compassion springs fidelity. From this arises the fact that Christ has not merely been once our high-priest and pattern, but that He is still so daily, ch. vii. 25.—As all kinds of suffering and distress are called temptations, 2 Cor. x. 13, and in like manner the sufferings of Christ, Luke xxii. 28, we can also say that Christ has been tempted of God, yet not for evil but for good, *viz.*, 1, in order to promote the honor of God and the salvation of men; 2, to reveal the immaculate holiness and transcendent power of Christ, that he might be the hero who should bear, without sinking under it, the wrath of God; 3, to open to him, by means of this suffering, the way to glory.—The sufferings of Christ were not only real, but *meritorious*, and were endured for our sake. Hence they come in our place, primarily in such a way, that they are reckoned to us for righteousness; and secondarily in such a way, that in our temptations, whether from without or from within, our high-priest comes to our aid with His instruction and His strengthening power. Temptations have been to Christ a source of great suffering; since although He had no sin and could not sin, yet it was, therefore, all the deeper sorrow to Him that sin was imputed to Him. This marked Christ's deepest humiliation.—Console thyself, thou devout bearer of the Cross, thou who art pressed and borne down by many a need; thy brother Jesus has also tasted all this; He knows how it weighs thee down; He can help thee, He will assuredly refresh thee, 2 Cor. iv. 10; 1 Pet. iv. 13.—After we have completely eliminated all imperfection, and all *painful* emotions from the compassionate sympathy of Christ in heaven, this tender human sympathy still appears in no wise incompatible with His glorified condition. And we must also know that the joy of His human nature in heaven cannot now be so great and perfect, because His mystical body is here as yet still surrounded with sorrows, and encompassed with infirmities, as it *will be* when, after the resurrection of the dead, all this shall have forever ceased.

SPENER:—Since all the power of Satan consists in *sin*, by which he deals with us as slaves, according to his will, redemption from this is a grand and precious feature of our blessedness, 1 John iii. 8; Rev. v. 5; Col. ii. 15.—Children

of God are already blessed in life, because delivered from the fear of death. They think of death with tranquil heart, and overcome in faith the fear that naturally cleaves to others, Luke ii. 29; 2 Cor. v. 8; Gen. xlvi. 30.—The redemption of Christ attaches not to those who still continue under reigning sin and the power of Satan, and *cannot* belong to them until, by true conversion and translation into the kingdom of light, they allow themselves to be delivered from the snares of the devil, Col. i. 1–13

BERLENBURGER BIBLE:—The incarnation of Christ is historically, indeed, well known to all, but in its secret mystery to but exceedingly few, both in respect of knowledge and practice.—The kingdom of death had to be overthrown in a rightful and legitimate way, by the payment of all its just demands.—The devil, through our sin, gained a dominion by *conquest;* not a legitimate and rightful sway, but a usurpation with our consent. He acquired by sin, a double prerogative, that of condemning and of ruling; both are taken from him.—That terror of conscience, which springs from sin, is man's living hell upon earth, so long as he does not take deliverance from it by grace and the spirit of divine gladness. Though a man may have had the *beginnings* of true repentance, he is still, by no means, exempt from *fear*. For then, indeed, he first feels a genuine shrinking from the wrath of God. He trembles at all God's righteous utterances and words, and finds no true refuge and deliverance from it, so long as he fails to exercise living faith.—This fruit of sin and of the apostasy is very deeply rooted, and has pervaded our entire human nature, so that to deal with it and eradicate it, is no light and easy matter. Even believing Christians have to strive daily that they may *hold* this enemy under the victory of faith, although he has once already been brought under its power.—Christ takes upon Himself not the seed of an evil and malignant nature, but the seed of promise.

LAURENTIUS:—To refrain from evil through fear of punishment, marks the slavish, not the filial spirit.—Only believers, the posterity of Abraham, are actually partakers of the redemption of Christ.

RAMBACH:—The devil is here described in respect, 1, of his name, as accuser and calumniator; 2, of his power; 3, of his overthrow.—O wondrous change! We were first created after the likeness of Christ, and now he is born after our likeness.—Christ can succor those that are tempted, since He, 1, has received the right and authority; 2, possesses the power to do so.

STEINHOFER:—There is a wondrous war waged on the cross, and an unanticipated victory in the death of this Just and Holy One.—Compassion toward sinners, and indifference toward sin, cannot possibly coexist.—*Atonement* is the mighty word wherewith we would honor Jesus in His office, and continually enjoy alike His compassion and His fidelity.

HAHN:—By the compassion of Jesus we must arm ourselves against impatience, since He exacts not too much from us, and we can repose confidence in Him; and His fidelity gives us consolation, and strengthens us against all unbelief.—Jesus is faithful: for He refused not to bear the worst that might befall Him; He awaited all, and shrank from nothing; He became not weary. It is only through this faithfulness that we reach the appointed goal.

RIEGER:—Every step in the ministry of Jesus was freely accepted by Him in the spirit of love; as, indeed, when about to be delivered into the hands of sinners, He said: Thinkest thou not that I could pray to my Father? But the command received from His Father, and His desire to leave nothing unaccomplished, lays upon Him the *necessity* to become in all things like unto His brethren.—Blessed is he to whom the Spirit of Christ so interprets this "in all things," and so applies it to *every thing*, that now, in all which he has daily to do and suffer, he enjoys this light upon his way. For thy sake the Saviour has once for all placed Himself in like circumstances.

HEUBNER:—So far is the *suffering* of Christ from impairing His dignity and power as a Saviour, that it is in fact only through this that He *becomes* a genuine Saviour.—God is indeed in Himself already compassionate, Ex. xxxiv. 6, but this compassion is revealed with entire clearness, and certainty only in the incarnation of the Son.

STIER:—The death of Christ has its significance as a *suffering of death;* and His suffering again only in the fact that He *was tempted* in that which He suffered.—In Christ's mediatorial office, concur all these varied and opposite elements: the *power* of the devil, the *just claim and righteousness* of God, and the *exigency* of man.

[OWEN:—Death is penal; and its being common unto all, hinders not, but that it is the punishment of every one.—According unto the means that men have to come unto the knowledge of the righteousness of God, are or ought to be their apprehensions of the evil that is in death. When bondage is complete, it lies in a tendency to future and greater evils. Such is the bondage of condemned malefactors reserved for the day of execution; such is the bondage of Satan, who is kept in chains of darkness for the judgment of the great day.—The Lord Christ out of His inexpressible love, willingly submitted Himself unto every condition of the children to be saved by Him, and to every thing in every condition of them, sin only excepted.—The *first* and *principal* end of the Lord Christ's assuming human nature, was not to *reign* in it, but to suffer and die in it.—He saw the work that was prepared unto Him—how He was to be exposed unto miseries, afflictions and persecutions, and at length to make His soul an offering for sin—yet because it was all for *the salvation of the children*, He was contented with it and delighted in it.—All the power of Satan in the world over any of the sons of men, is founded in *sin*, and the guilt of death attending it. Death entered by sin; the guilt of sin brought it in.—If the guilt of death be not removed from any, the power of the devil extends unto them. A power it is, indeed, that is regulated. Were it sovereign or absolute, He would continually devour. But it is limited unto times, seasons, and degrees, by the will of God, the Judge of all.—The death of Christ, through the wise and righteous disposal of God, is victorious, all-conquering and prevalent.—

Satan laid his claim unto the person of Christ, but coming to put it in execution, he met with that great and hidden power in Him which He knew not, and was utterly conquered.—Satan will fly at the sign of the cross *rightly made.*—The Lord Christ *suffered* under *all* His temptations, *sinned* in *none.*—Tempted sufferers not only wanted one to undertake for them, but to undertake for them with care, pity and tenderness.—Temptations cast souls into danger.—The great duty of tempted souls is to cry out unto the Lord Christ for help and relief. He is "faithful;" He is "merciful," and that which is the effect of them both, He is "able"].

SECOND SECTION.

SUPERIORITY OF JESUS CHRIST TO THE DIVINELY-SENT SERVANTS AND LEADERS OF ISRAEL, MOSES AND JOSHUA.

I.

The exhortation to fidelity toward Christ, the faithful Messenger of God, rests on the preëminence of Christ, as Son *ruling over* the house, above Moses, the faithful *servant in* the house.

CHAPTER III. 1–6.

Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the [a] heavenly calling, consider [κατανοή-
σατε, mark with attention, observe attentively] the Apostle and High Priest of our
2 profession [ὁμολογίας, confession], Christ Jesus[1] [*om.* Christ]; Who was faithful to him
3 that appointed him, as also Moses *was faithful* in all[2] his house. For this *man* [this per-
sonage, he] was [has been] counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch [by as
much] as he who hath builded [established, κατασκευάσας] the house hath more honor
4 than the house. For every house is builded [established] by some *man* [one]; but he
5 that built [established] all things[3] *is* God. And Moses verily [Moses indeed] *was*
faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be
6 spoken after [to the things hereafter to be spoken, τῶν λαληθησομένων]; But Christ as
a Son [was] over his own [his, αὐτοῦ] house; whose house are we, if we hold fast the
confidence [boldness, παῤῥησία] and the rejoicing [glorying, καύχημα] of the [our] hope
firm unto the end.[4]

[1] Ver. 1.—The simple Ἰησοῦν has in its favor the usage of the Epistle, and the authority of A. B. C.* D.* xvii. 34. [So Alf., Lün., *etc.*].

[2] Ver. 2.—The ὅλῳ is sustained by the authority of Sin. A. C. D. E. K. L. M., and by the fact of its being found in the passage (Num. xii. 7), which is virtually cited by the author.

[3] Ver. 4.—Instead of τὰ πάντα we should read barely πάντα after Sin. A. B. C.* D.* Ξ.* K. M., 17, 53.

[4] Ver. 6.—Μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν is, since Mill, regarded by some as a gloss transferred from ver. 14, and is harsh, though not without classical analogies. [It is harsh as to gender, overleaping καύχημα, and going back to the preceding παῤῥησίαν, or possibly determined by ἐλπίδος. A more serious objection is the repetition of so marked a phrase in two passages so near each other (vv. 6 and 14), which, as Del. well observes, is singular in so careful and practised a writer. Hence Del., with Tisch., expunges it; Bleek, De Wette, Thol., Lün., retain it. —K.]. It is sustained by Sin. A. C. D. E. K. L. M.

[Ver. 1.—Ὅθεν, *whence, wherefore*, logical, as nearly, or quite always in this Epistle.—Κατανοήσατε: κατά emphatic; *mark with attention, contemplate earnestly.* MOLL: "*Richtet euren Sinn auf.*' 'Κατανοεῖν, of lingering, penetrating regard, a favorite word of Luke." (Del.)—Ἀπόστολον, commissioned one, then *Apostle.* Moll and Del.: *Gottesbote*; De Wette: *der Gesandte*; used of Christ as God's great commissioned one of the New Testament, as Moses was of the Old. Moses was the ἀπόστολος and Aaron the ἀρχιερεύς of the Old Covenant; Christ combines in himself both characters in the New.

Ver. 2—πιστὸν ὄντα, *being faithful.* Eng. ver. renders "*was* faithful;" so De Wette; Moll, following Bleek, renders *is*, but justly censures Bleek for pressing the force of the present ὄντα. The truth is ὄντα is not necessarily present at all, except to the time that is expressed by the finite verb, or that is *present to the mind of the writer.* Here I take it to be clearly that of Christ's residence on earth, and hence follow Eng. ver. and De W., in supplying *was* rather than Moll and Del. in rendering *is*. But see exposition.

Ver. 3.—"This man," Eng. ver., οὗτος is often difficult to render into Eng. 'This one' is inelegant English; 'This man,' directs an undue amount of attention to the word 'man' (for here the reference is almost equally to Christ's sojourn as 'man' on earth, and his present heavenly exaltation): 'this personage,' is too formal; 'he' is not sufficiently emphatic. The German *dieser* is unexceptionable. *Has been counted* or *deemed worthy*; ἠξίωται Perf., much better than Auth. ver. "*was* counted worthy," because the reference is not merely to that reward of glorification which Jesus once received, but which he *still retains.*

Ver. 4.—*Founded*, κατασκευάζειν, *furnish out, prepare, equip*; not οἰκοδομεῖν, *to build*, as also the noun is not οἰκία, *a house* proper, but οἶκον, *an estate, a domestic establishment, a household.*

Ver. 5.—"And Moses indeed," or "while Moses.' Eng. ver. renders μέν here, as often elsewhere, "verily;" but always unfortunately.

Ver. 6.—Χριστὸς ὡς υἱὸς ἐπί, *etc.* The ellipsis may be supplied so as to read, "But Christ, as a Son, was faithful over His house," or "was faithful, as a Son, over His house;" or, "as a Son was over His house," which construction I adopt with Moll and Del. (except that they put *is* for *was*, which, perhaps, is admissible, the discussion sliding forward into the present) as the simplest, the idea of *fidelity* retreating, and that of *authority* becoming prominent. Both the best texts and the connection demand His (*viz.*, God's αὐτοῦ) not *his own* (ἑαυτοῦ).—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of a heavenly calling.**—The ὅθεν, *wherefore*, links the exhortation of this verse with the preceding characterization of Jesus. The same holds also of the designation of the readers ("holy brethren") who, however, are not here addressed as *brethren of Christ* (Michael., Carpz., *etc.*), nor as Jewish compatriots of the writer (Chr. Fr. Schmidt); but as consecrated members of the Christian brotherhood, who have become partakers of a call to the kingdom of God, which has come from heaven (ἐπουράνιος,=ἡ ἄνω κλῆσις, Phil. iii. 14, comp. Heb. xii. 25), and has proved itself *effectual*, *i. e.*, has secured to them an actual participation in heavenly treasures and blessings (Col. i. 5)—designations from which the following exhortation receives, alike in form and substance, both confirmation and emphasis. The combination "holy brethren" is not found elsewhere (1 Thess. v. 27, the reading is doubtful), but is here a most appropriate summary of the ideas developed from ch. ii. 11. The other epithets point still further back—to ch. ii. 1, and even i. 1. [ἅγιοι, as usual also with Paul, marks of course not the degree of individual holiness, but the collective, and, so to speak, *official*, or rather *ideal* character of Christians. As a community in their relation to Christ, who alone can procure sanctification, they are characteristically ἅγιοι.—K.].

Consider attentively the apostle and high-priest of our confession.—Κατανοεῖν denotes the turning of the νοῦς to an object, not, however, for the sake of theoretical recognition, but for the practical weighing of that which we have in Him—*i. e.*, for moral and spiritual heeding. The two epithets, descriptive of Jesus, bring most impressively before the readers the substance of the preceding statements. Jesus is the highest organ of the revelation of God to man, and at the same time the true and perfect Mediator of redemption. Precisely for this reason He is not like Moses and Joshua, a mere lawgiver and leader, but with all His resemblance to these servants of God, is yet exalted infinitely above them. To avoid all misunderstanding, however, He is not called ἄγγελος, but ἀπόστολος, which word corresponds as well with the Heb. *maleach*, as with His essential relations, Gal. iv. 4; John iii. 34; v. 36; vi. 29; x. 36; xx. 21. Thol. and Biesenthal (after Braun, Deyling, Schöttg.) are inclined to refer the term to Rabbinical usage, in which ἀπόστολος=שְׁלִיחַ might bear the sense of *Mediator.* But according to Del. the priest has this name only precisely in his quality of *delegate* partly of God, partly of the congregation. Otto ("*The Apostle and High Priest of our confession*," 1861) assumes a reference to Num. xiii., and sums up the result of his investigation in the following paraphrase: "Therefore, ye brethren who have been rescued from the world, and been endowed with the prerogative of a heavenly home and citizenship, observe that the Apostle and High-priest of our confession, *i. e.*, He who first trod the sacred land of our inheritance with the confession, 'Jehovah delivers,' and now stands at our head as leader, but who at the same time is the high-priest of our confession, *i. e.*, who brings before God our confession, 'Jehovah delivers,' in that He secures by His mediation our entrance into the heavenly home,—in fine that the Apostle and High priest of our confession, Jesus (as it were, *our* Joshua) is πιστός to Him who has constituted Him." We have here an interpolation of references and allusions which, indeed, a subtle ingenuity might easily enough light upon, but which are wholly alien to the context. Equally without foundation is also the remark of Kluge (p. 19): "From His κλῆσις, *act of calling*, the Son receives the name of ἀπόστολος, from His ἁγιάζειν, *sanctifying*, the name of ἀρχιερεύς." In His two-fold character Jesus is immediately described as belonging specifically to *our*, *i. e.*, the *Christian* confession, in order that the readers may direct their mind to Him, and consider what they have in Him. The rendering of the *Itala: Constitutionis nostræ*, reminding us perhaps of the 'Messenger of the Covenant' (Mal. iii. 1), is inadmissible, since ὁμολογία in the New Testament signifies only *confession*, *acknowledgment*, never '*contract* or *covenant*,' and this along with the subject (De W.) and the object (Bl., Lün.) of the confession, 2 Cor. ix. 13; 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13. The Gen. marks possession, *belonging to.* [The high-priest who belongs to our confession: the high-priest whom we confess, *acknowledge*, *i. e.*, (as Beng.) *agree with;* God λέγει, man ὁμολογεῖ.]

Ver. 2. **Who was faithful to him that appointed him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house.** — According to Otto πιστός does not designate a *moral* quality, but "position next the heart of a higher personage" (p. 47), and should for this reason be taken in the sense of *trusted*, *confidential*, *organ of trust.* This by no means harmonizes with ch. ii. 17, where assuredly a moral quality is indicated for the display of which in His high-priestly calling the Son of God became incarnate. *But the faithfulness of Jesus creates an obligation of like faithfulness in His church.* The *mention* of the former lays a foundation for *demanding* the latter; and this all the more in that the two historical and visible founders of the old and of the new covenant, in their exhibition of this fidelity in their respective positions, have left a pattern to their disciples, that, *viz.*, of *fidelity toward Him to whom they owed their respective historical positions.* In this respect there is a close analogy between Jesus and Moses, which adds weight to the writer's exhortation. The object of κατανοεῖν, *attentively observe*, is not the fact that Jesus is a πιστός (Otto), but the person of Jesus, already signalized as entirely peculiar, and whose permanently abiding quality the ὄντα renders prominent. Bleek, after Seb. Schmidt, erroneously presses the present, as if indicating that the reference is to the exalted Messiah. It is also an error (with Calv., Bl., Ebr.) to place a comma after Moses; for the fol-

lowing words are cited from Num. xii. 7, and apply properly only to Moses. For in respect of Jesus we are immediately reminded of His prerogative of being *over* the house. [I doubt if this is any adequate reason against inserting the comma with Calv., Bl., and Ebr. Because although Christ was *a Son over the house*, He was also *a servant in the house*, and the point of *resemblance* is that which is first adverted to: the *distinction* comes out later. In His double character Christ could be at once compared and contrasted with Moses. Like him and more fully than he, He proved a faithful servant in God's house, but unlike him, He was also a Son over it. In the exceedingly elliptical language of the author some elements of the parallel are taken for granted, and hence its difficulty. Still I incline on the whole, though with hesitation, to obliterate the comma after Moses.—K.]*

The *ποιεῖν*, *make*, *constitute*, *appoint*, denotes the placing or putting forward of Christ on the theatre of history (De W., Del., Thol.). Bleek, Lünemann, and Alford, with Ital., Ambros., Primas., D. Schultz, adhere to the proper signification of the word, and refer the *ποιεῖν* either to the incarnation of the Son, or to His eternal generation. [Alford: "The word, thus taken, however, is, of course, to be understood of that constitution of our Lord as Apostle and High-priest, in which He, being human, was made by the Father"]. They are right, in so far as they take the word absolutely; for it is quite unnecessary to supply a second accusative (as is done by the majority following Chrys.), as if the construction were "who made Him, scil., Apostle or high-priest." But on the other hand, to refer the word to the "eternal generation"—considering that *ποιεῖν* is used ch. i. 1 for actual creation, would give the passage a strong tincture of Arianism, and resolve Christ into a *creature* (*κτίσμα*), in decided contradiction to ch. i. 3. And again, to refer the word to the *incarnation*—the commencement of the temporal and earthly life of Jesus—though done by the orthodox Fathers, is scarcely admissible; for this term would hardly have been employed to designate the assumption of human nature by the Logos in the bosom of the virgin, or the overshadowing influence of the Holy Spirit and of the "power of the Highest" (Luke i. 35). The author was, perhaps, led to the term by 1 Sam. xii. 6 [*ὁ ποιήσας τὸν Μωυσῆν καὶ τὸν Ἀαρών*. Heb. עָשָׂה]. Bl. The house *οἶκος* designates the family of God, or the Theocratic nation (x. 21), in which Moses had a position in which he could show fidelity. The reference of *αὐτοῦ* to Moses (Oec. and *alt.*, with whom I formerly agreed) is inadmissible, since the words refer to Num. i. 2, 7: the reference to Christ (Bl., Riehm) would be *anticipating*.

VER. 3. **For of greater glory than Moses has he been deemed worthy by how much,** *etc.*—The passage is not explaining or analyzing ver. 2 (De W.), but enforcing the exhortation *κατανοήσατε*. It expresses directly the elevation of Jesus above Moses, which appears all the more worthy of regard as it comes out in connection with the recognition of a like fidelity on the part of both. The relation between them is then illustrated in the relation which always exists between a house and its founder. *Κατασκευ.* is not barely *building*, but fitting out a house with furniture and servants. But from this it does not follow that we are to construct *τοῦ οἴκου* with *τιμήν*, *honor from the house* (Wolf, Michael., Steng., *etc.*). The Gen. depends rather on *πλείονα*. The respect and admiration rendered to a house redound in a very high degree to him who has reared and established it. In the same relation stands the glory (*δόξα*) of Christ to that of Moses. There is here no comparison drawn between the splendor of the *countenance* of Moses when, having spoken with Jehovah on the mount, he was about to utter His word to Israel, and the radiance which involved the *whole person* of Jesus on the mount of transfiguration (HOFM., *Weissag.*, II. 188). The reference is to the glory of their respective callings and positions. Entirely untenable is the assertion of Del., that by understanding *Christ* to be here referred to as the founder, we involve in confusion the entire course of argumentation. Such a view by no means necessitates the absurd conclusion that in that case Moses must be the house. For the thought may perfectly well be, that Moses, as servant, is only a member or *a part* of the house of which Christ is the *founder*. We can only say that the language does not speak *directly* and in terms of Christ, but has the form of a universal statement, and that there appears as yet no occasion to pass beyond the comparison immediately expressed in the text between the relation of Jesus to Moses and the relation of a founder to a house. But we involuntarily turn our *thoughts* upon Jesus, and are justified in applying the passage to Him, as the founder of that house of God which we Christians constitute.

VER. 4. **For every house is established by some one: but he who established all things is God.**—This is also a general statement of unquestionable correctness, forming a link between the premise and the conclusion, but neither the conclusion itself, nor a remark merely incidental and parenthetical. If Christ is founder of the true Theocracy, it follows not from this that He has reared this house *alongside* of that which was established through the instrumentality of Moses. The general statement that God is the universal founder and establisher, who has placed Jesus, as He formerly did Moses, in His historical position [as founder of His New Testament house], would rather and simply suggest that the Theocracy founded by Jesus is in correspondence with the will of God. [And also, perhaps, it incidentally illustrates the way in which both Moses and Jesus *could be* faithful—the ground on which fidelity could be predicated of them, *viz.*, that while each of these was a founder in his respective sphere, yet each worked under God as su-

* [Regarding the fidelity of Moses Owen speaks thus: "Moses was faithful. It is true he failed *personally* in his faith, and was charged of God in that he believed Him not (Num. xx. 12); but this was in respect of his own faith in one particular, and is no impeachment of his faithfulness in the special office intended. As he was the Apostle, the ambassador of God, to reveal His mind, and institute His worship, he was universally faithful: for he declared and did all things according to His will and appointment, by the testimony of God Himself, Ex. xl. 16, 'According to all that the Lord commanded him so did he.' He withheld nothing of what God revealed or commanded, nor did he add any thing thereunto; and herein did his faithfulness consist"].

preme founder, and to whom, therefore, both stood responsible.—K.].

Many older expositors have erroneously regarded (with Theodoret) ϑεός as *predicate*, and found in it a proof passage for the divinity of Jesus, whom they assumed to be the subject. So also Otto, who, by οἶκος, ver. 3, understands specially the house of God, and thus paraphrases the following (p. 87 and 96): "For every house is founded by some one (but to meet and supply *all* its needs is in the power of none). He who has furnished the house with *every thing* (as Jesus, for example, has supplied it with all that was needful for time and eternity),—such an one is all-powerful,—such an one must be Divine (ϑεός)." But the absence of the article involves no necessity of assuming this construction, for ϑεός here has nearly the force of a proper name; and the connection is opposed to it. [Alford: "Apart from the extreme harshness and forcing of the construction to bring out this meaning, the sentiment itself is entirely irrelevant here. If the writer was proving Christ to be greater than Moses, inasmuch as He is God, the founder of all things, then clearly the mere assertion of this fact would have sufficed for the proof, without entering on any other consideration; nay, after such an assertion, all minor considerations would have been not only superfluous, but preposterous. He does, however, after this, distinctly go into the consideration of Christ being faithful, not as a servant, but as a Son, so that he cannot be here speaking of his Deity as a ground of superiority"].

Πᾶς οἶκος designates not the house in all its parts, the *whole* house, but according to the usage of our Epistle v. 1, 13; viii. 3 [and correct classical usage], *every house*. They who refer the previous clause (ὁ κατασκευάσας αὐτόν) directly to Jesus, interpolate the idea that the question is here answered how fidelity can be predicated of Jesus, at the same time that He is asserted to be the *founder* of the Theocracy. The solution then is this: The Theocracy stands in the same category with every household, in that it must have a [subordinate] founder; while it yet remains true that God is the *causa prima* of each and all (Thol., Ebr., *etc.*) But the question itself, raising such a query, and demanding a solution, is entirely gratuitous: inasmuch as the Messiah has been from the outset designated as Son, and in the most definite manner declared to be the *Mediator* of Revelation and Redemption, as well as Mediator of the creation and government of the world. In these relations then the matter of His fidelity has of course already come up and been disposed of. This point is no longer under discussion; the topic now under consideration is the relation of him who has founded a house to the house. And as God is the supreme and universal founder, the Theocracy, as well in its Christian as in its Mosaic form, must be referred back to Him. And in perfect harmony with this view is the fact that a little before God is styled in reference to the Messiah ὁ ποιήσας αὐτόν, and that it is only by this view that the following verse (ver. 5) is brought into logical connection with ver. 3, as legitimately authorizing its assertion of the superior glory (δόξα) of Christ. [That is: ver. 3, Christ, the founder of the New Testament house, is declared to have been deemed worthy of higher glory than Moses, by all the difference between the founder of the house and the house itself. Then ver. 4 reminds us that the New Testament house, as well as the Old Testament Mosaic house, was also founded under the ultimate and supreme direction of God, whence Moses and Christ, both in their respective positions, sustained direct relations to God, each having been *placed*, constituted, *viz.* ποιήσας, by God in his position. Consequently we are prepared at ver. 5, to see the *different* relation which these two personages sustained to the house, on the one hand, and to God as the common founder, on the other; Moses being a servant, and Christ a Son; Moses being *in* the house and a *part* of it, and Christ *over* it. Yet I cannot see, after all, any very essential difference between the author's view of the force of ὁ δὲ κατασκευάσας, and that of Ebrard and Tholuck, which he rejects. Ebrard makes it declare God the supreme founder, and thus answer the implied question, *how* Christ as founder could have fidelity predicated of Him. Moll says: that "as God is the universal founder, therefore, the Theocracy, in its Christian as well as in its Mosaic form, must be referred back to Him." This comes to near the same thing as the other. Both make the passage put God as universal and supreme founder into His true relation to both Moses and Jesus in their respective spheres. But with respect to the statement of Moll, regarding the Mediatorship of the Son, he seems to me to put the Son's mediatorship in the creation and government of the world, as eternal Logos, one and equal with the Father, too nearly on a level with His Mediatorship in His humbled and servile character as Redeemer. In the latter the question of His *fidelity* is indeed often raised, and is absolutely vital: in the former relation, I do not remember where the term πιστός is applied to Him, and I scarcely see how it could be without derogating from His divine dignity.—K]. Riehm's opinion, (*Lehrbegriff*, I. 310) that Christ is designated as the founder of the Old Testament kingdom of God, and that Moses has held his position in it as assigned by Christ, cannot be substantiated by an appeal to the doctrine of our Epistle, that the Son is the Mediator of every form of divine agency that is directed to the world. It is here decidedly to be rejected, because the subject of discourse is here specially *Jesus*, the Messiah, as actually and historically manifested.

[Moll's exposition of this difficult and vexed passage seems to labor under obscurity from his having failed to do justice to the elliptical character of the passage. The first thing, it seems to me, to be settled, is whether Moses and Christ are conceived by the author, as both in *one* house of God, or as in *two*, *i. e.*, each in that respectively to which God had assigned him. This Alford, following Delitzsch, denies, maintaining that both are in one house of God, Moses as servant, and Christ as Son, and that the force and "strictness of the comparison" requires this. It seems to me that this confounding of the houses in which Moses and Christ were, raises at once an inexplicable diffi-

culty. The question arises, How could Moses be in a house which was not reared or founded until by Christ, many centuries after? Or, how could Jesus found or rear a house in which Moses had officiated as servant, many centuries before? For that Christ founded or reared the New Testament house of God, is certain, and Christ, on the other hand, did not rear the Old Testament house of God; for Christ, the God-man, the Mediator, Jesus, had not then an existence. And to bring in here the Logos, the Eternal Son, as founding the Old Testament economy, is entirely out of the question; for with *Him* as such, the passage has nothing to do. The comparison is between *Moses* and *Jesus*, and by the whole tenor and sentiment of the Epistle, it is between Moses, as the servant of God in founding the Old Testament or Jewish economy, in rearing the house of God in its Old Testament form, and Jesus, in founding the New Testament economy—in rearing the house of God in its New Testament form. The comparison is between the two *historical characters* in the work which each respectively had performed. And it matters not that the two houses—the house of Moses and the house of Jesus—are in their deepest significance one house—as they certainly are—both God's house—yet for the purposes, and in the representation of the author, they are *different* houses—the one an earthly, transitory, typical house, the other a heavenly, spiritual, imperishable house. In these two houses, respectively stand Moses and Jesus; both raised up of God, *made*, *constituted* (see ποιήσας applied to Moses, 1 Sam. xii. 6, and to Jesus, Heb. iii. 2, I have little doubt the latter suggested by the former)—each for his special work. Each was a founder, an institutor, inaugurator,—Moses of the Old Testament economy, Jesus of the New Testament economy. Each had the high honor of being appointed by God as the introducer and inaugurator of His respective system. But each was not only a *founder*, he was also a *servant:* Moses a servant (θεράπων, often so called in the Sept.); Jesus still more manifestly and deeply a servant (δοῦλος, διάκονος); yet both faithful in both relations. Moses was faithful as a founder under God, of the old economy, and as a servant in it; Christ was faithful as a founder, under God, of the new economy, and as a servant in it. Thus far the resemblance; now the contrast. Moses, while apparently a founder of the old economy, a builder of the Old Testament house, was in reality *only* a servant in it; his highest function was purely ministerial. Christ, while apparently, and indeed really a servant in the New Testament house, yet in reality was a Son over it; His character of servant was but secondary and temporary; His highest and true nature was that of Son. Thus Moses, the apparent builder of the Old Testament house, yet in reality and ultimately sinks to the level of the house, and becomes a part of it. Jesus, the builder of the New Testament house, and also seemingly an humble servant in it, yet ultimately rises completely above this servile condition, and by virtue of His essential equality and identity with God, the Supreme Founder of all things, becomes precisely as much superior to Moses as the founder of the house which He truly and absolutely was, is to the house itself, to which Moses only belonged as a part. The paradox, it is perceived, is a necessary one. It grows out of the double nature of the great Head of the New Testament Church. Lower than the angels, He yet rises in position, as He was in essential nature, infinitely above them. Appearing lower than Moses—as much lower as a δοῦλος, *slave*, is lower than a θεράπων, *voluntary attendant*, He yet rises transcendently and infinitely above him, by virtue of that nature which He shared in common with the eternal Father. I should, therefore, paraphrase the exceedingly elliptical passage somewhat as follows, reminding the reader that the *facts* regarding the positions both of Moses and of Christ—and certainly of the former—were so well-known, that the author, in his comparison, could safely presuppose them: "Consider—Jesus, who was faithful in the New Testament house of God to Him who constituted Him as builder and servant, as also Moses was faithful in all God's Old Testament house to Him who constituted him builder and servant in it. For Jesus has been deemed worthy of, and been advanced to, higher glory than Moses, by how much the builder of the house has more honor than the house. For every house (and of course, therefore, the Old and the New Testament houses) must be founded immediately and secondarily by some one, as was the former by Moses, and the latter by Jesus; but He who ultimately and absolutely founded all things, and therefore was ultimate and supreme founder of these, was God. And while Moses, though apparent and formal founder of the Old Testament house, was in reality in his highest nature, but in it, and strictly but a part of it, Jesus, the founder of the New Testament house, though apparently a servant in it, was, in reality, and in His highest nature, as Son, equal with and substantially identical with the absolute and Supreme Founder Himself."—This paraphrase introduces no elements into the comparison which are not presupposed in it, and which do not lie on the very face of the historical facts. It simply says thus: Moses and Jesus, each a founder of and a servant in the Old and the New Testament Theocracy respectively; each appointed of God and each faithful; but Moses, after all, only faithful as a servant, who was thus but part of the house; but Christ faithful as a Son, who was, therefore, in spite of His servile appearance, equal with the Supreme Founder Himself.

The only point on which there can be doubt, is as to the dual nature of the house of God; but I confess I do not see how there can be legitimate doubt on this point. Moll himself, who with most, denies this duality, is yet obliged to speak of the house of God "in its Old and its New Testament form," and I suppose he could hardly deny that Moses was founder or rearer of the house in its Old Testament form, as was Jesus of the house in its New Testament form. But this comes very nearly to the same thing as affirming two houses. None can doubt that ultimately, and in their deepest meaning, they were indeed identical; *i. e.*, both were not only from one Supreme Founder, but stood in close connection with the same great economy of salvation. But *formally*, and historically, and according to

the whole scope and treatment of our author, they were different; as different as the Mosaic Tabernacle in which Aaron ministered, and the heavenly Tabernacle in which Christ ministered; as different as were the many animal sacrifices of the one, from the single spiritual and life-giving offering of the other. The Old Testament house of God which Moses reared, but in which he was but servant, was earthly, material, typical and transitory; the New Testament house of God which Jesus reared, apparently a servant, but in reality a Son and Lord, is heavenly, spiritual, archetypal and eternal.—K.].

Ver. 5. **And while Moses indeed is faithful**, *etc.*—Moses, as well as Christ, has been raised up, set forth by God, and designated in his fidelity, not merely for an individual service, or for a special department of action in the administration of God's house, and his agency and fidelity stand in relation to the entire Theocracy. But (as shown by the Μωϋσῆς μὲν, *Moses indeed*, within this similar relation, which is common to Moses and Christ, we are to recognize a profound and fundamental *difference* in the two persons. Moses has officiated as a *servant*, by no means indeed as a slave (δοῦλος), or as a domestic servant, or menial, (οἰκέτης), but (Wis. x. 16) as a θεράπων, a word always implying voluntary subordination, and willing and honorable service. But at the same time all this has been but *typical* and *preparatory*. The λαληθησόμενα are not the revelations which Moses was hereafter *himself* to receive, thus requiring the translation: "in order to render testimony to that which was then to be spoken." Bleek, De W., Thol., Lün., so understanding the words, refer them specially to the *law;* Riehm reminds us of the expression, Numb. xii. 8, στόμα κατὰ στόμα λαλήσω αὐτῷ. These words, it is true, indicated the definite point in the life of Moses in which to him himself future revelations were promised. But the question is here no longer of the *resemblance* between Jesus and Moses, in fidelity to their respective vocations, but of the elevation of Christ above Moses, which, in fact, receives attestation even from the fidelity of Moses, who scrupulously held himself entirely within his prescribed sphere. The term refers therefore to those revelations to whose necessity the very ministry of Moses renders in all respects its testimony; and these, too, are not the revelations of later prophecy, nor specially, again, the declarations contained in our Epistle. They are rather those which have been disclosed in full perfection in the Son, John v. 49 (Erasm., Calv., Ebr., Hofm., Del., *etc.*). Precisely for this reason the name now employed is not Ἰησοῦς, but χριστός.

Ver. 6. **Yet Christ as a Son over his house, whose house are we.**—The reading, ὅς, instead of οὗ, in ver. 6, is critically unsustained, and the article is wanting before οἶκος, as frequently before θεός, νόμος, and similar familiar terms. The house is still the Theocracy in which Moses served, but at the head of which stands Christ, who, as Son of Him who appointed Him, and erected the house, receives a position of authority and preëminence, and inasmuch as He, as Son of God, is not merely Lord and Heir of all possessions, but the essential agent in originating and procuring them, has a corresponding glory. These declarations, with which the Epistle opens, could not possibly remain unregarded by the readers. But with them the representation here given stands in the most perfect harmony, and ὡς υἱός emphatically precedes, because, while even a servant of higher grade might be entrusted with the management of a household, yet this would leave the specific distinction between Christ and Moses entirely unexpressed. For this reason we are neither to refer αὐτοῦ, ver. 5, to God, and αὐτοῦ, ver. 6, to Christ (Œcum., Bl., De W., *etc.*), as if designing to place in contrast the fact that Moses has his special position in an alien house, but Christ in His own; nor are these genitives to be regarded as genitives of reference=*in his*, *i. e.*, in the house assigned to him (Ebr., who speaks confusedly of *two* houses); but they both refer grammatically to God (Chrys., Theod., Calv., Lun., Del., *etc.*), as does also the relative οὗ, although referring as matter of fact to the Christian dispensation; for this is quite frequently called the house of God, x. 21; 1 Cor. iii. 9, 16; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Eph. ii. 22; 1 Tim. iii. 15; 1 Pet. iv. 17; ii. 5; but never the house of Christ. We give most emphasis to the contrast by simply supplying ἐστίν with χριστὸς δὲ—αὐτοῦ (Erasm., Grot., Del., *etc.*), while the supplying of πιστός ἐστιν is yet undoubtedly admissible, ch. x. 21; Matth. xxv. 21 (Bez., Grot., Thol., *etc.*); not, however, twice (Bl., De W., Bisp.)=Christ (is faithful) as a Son over his house (is faithful). The ὡς cannot here signify *quemadmodum*, but simply *ut*.

Provided that we hold fast the confidence and the glorying of our hope, *etc.*—Christianity, as such, bears the above assigned character of the 'house of God;' hence exclusion from the temple need occasion no anxiety to the Church. But whether, as a Church, we *preserve* this character (not whether we are permitted personally to apply to ourselves this designation, or to regard ourselves as this house), depends on the fulfilment of the requisite condition. The παῤῥησία denotes here, as ch. iv. 16; x. 19, 35; not bold confession (Grot., *etc.*), but resolute confidence, and triumphant joyfulness of faith, corresponding to the πληροφορία τῆς ἐλπίδος mentioned ch. vi. 11, which gives to itself a corresponding expression, even in the most unfavorable circumstances. This expression the ὁμολογία τῆς ἐλπίδος, ch. x. 23, is here called καύχημα, which denotes the *result* of the act of glorying (καύχησις), not *glorying itself* (Bl., *etc.*), and not the mere *object* of glorying (Lün.). The ἐλπίς denotes, in a specifically Christian sense, the hope of the perfect consummation of the Kingdom of God, and of participation therein. For this reason μέχρι τέλους refers not to the death of the individual (Schlicht., Grot., Kuin.), but to the end of the present order of things.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The *connection* of Christians among one another has its peculiar character, as that of a holy association, in the fact that it, as a fellowship of the children of God, who are called to the Kingdom of Heaven, received its beginning, its

progress, and perfection, alone through *its living connection with the historical God-Man.* It is hence charged with the duty, not merely of recognizing this relation, but also of expressing it *in confession and in action,* and hence, in imitation of, and likeness to Christ, of appropriating to itself *His fidelity,* as a principle which lies at the very basis of perfection in life.

2. In their fidelity, in their respective vocations, towards God who has given to His messengers their respective historical position, appears a striking parallel between Jesus and Moses, inasmuch as the vocation of both has special reference to the *establishment of the kingdom of God* among men. It is by this that Moses takes precedence above all the prophets and messengers of God in the Old Covenant. But the infinite elevation of Jesus Christ is not, in this respect, in the slightest degree disparaged; but within the limits of the parallel stands forth sharply and clearly. Moses was neither priest nor king, but *within the Theocracy,* to whose establishment his ministry and fidelity had reference, was a *servant,* and so served that the *true* theocracy was designated by Himself as *still in the future.* Christ, on the contrary, is a High-Priest and for this reason, inasmuch as redemption was accomplished through His sacrifice of Himself, He announces, at the same time, a *present salvation;* and again, because He is *Son* He appears, indeed, as a messenger of God, but is, at the same time, *ruler* over the kingdom of God, and not one of its servants and citizens.

3. The *confession* of Christians has, as its specific subject, the *historical God-man,* and Him, as one who in His essential agency appears as, at one and the same time, the author and the herald of salvation. This confession is the original, universal, and comprehensive confession of the primitive church. It is the fundamental, Apostolical, Scriptural testimony, which, as such, is not merely to regulate subsequent developments of doctrine, but also, as an expression of the living faith of the Church, has to direct individual souls in their impulses of thought, feeling, and will, toward the person of that Saviour, who, as Son of God, possesses an incomparable elevation, an everlasting ministry, and a Divine ubiquity.

4. The *actual earthly ministry* of Jesus, with its beginning in time, within local relations, and under given conditions, by no means reduces Him as a *historical personage,* to the level of a *creature.* Nor is this result produced by the fact that the life of the God-man has an actual historical *commencement.* For although the commencement of the life, and the ministry of Jesus may, and must, on the one hand, be regarded as determined, and at a definite point of time, originated by the will and power of God, yet, on the other, we must maintain with equal emphasis the self-determining purpose and act of the Son of God by which, in time as well as in eternity, He kept Himself in undisturbed harmony with the will of His Father. For the Holy Scripture says no less that He *came*—Matth. ix. 13; xviii. 11; John xvi. 28; xviii. 37, than that He *was sent,* Matth. x. 40; John xx. 21, and lays no less emphasis upon His *offering Himself* in sacrifice (John x. 17, 18; Eph. v. 2; Heb. vii. 27), than upon His *being delivered up* for the expiation of the sins of the world (Rom. viii. 32; John iii. 16; 1 John iv. 10). Neither again has the man Jesus at any time received or acquired the Divine nature; nor has the preëxistent Son of God so "emptied Himself" in His incarnation, that a complete destitution of the essence of the Logos, even to the extent of an unconsciousness of the commencement of life, existed in the human embryo. But the uncreated Son of God received, at the incarnation, human nature into the personal unity of an actual theanthropic consciousness and life. If the carrying out of the doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum,* led in fact to that conception of the κένωσις which we have just denied, which Gess. (*The Doctrine of the Person of Christ,* Basle, 1856) has most unqualifiedly developed, it were then high time to surrender this *form* of our doctrine for the sake of preserving its real *substance.* The *inconsequence* of the earlier Lutheran theologians, who denied the applicability of the intrinsically possible fourth kind of the *communicatio idiomatum* argues a higher mode of thinking, and is substantially more correct than the formal consistency of many recent divines; but still shows the necessity of a reconstruction of this doctrinal formula which, in the form it has hitherto held, is untenable.

5. In that *the same* God who brought forward Moses upon the stage of history, in like manner brought forward Jesus, any internal contradiction between the Mosaic and the Christian Theocracy is out of the question; while at the same time the *fidelity* of these two persons who are brought into comparison—a fidelity having reference to the theocracy in its *collective* character as a *house* of God—furnishes a pledge that in both cases the founding and arrangement of the house in question has been made in entire accordance with the Divine will. But the diversity of the two persons introduces a corresponding diversity *of the Mosaic and the Christian Theocracy.* And equally also from the *diversity of the economies,* which, as a matter of fact, comes first under our eyes, we may reason back to the diversity of the persons. And this diversity is not barely that relative diversity expressing itself in a merely negative way, which the synagogal Midrash expresses in the words (Jalkut on Is. lii. 13): "the servant of Jehovah, the King Messiah, will be more venerable than Abraham, more exalted than Moses, higher than the angels of the service;" but it is the positive and absolute distinction between preparation and fulfilment on the one hand, and between a creaturely *servant,* and a son and lord equal with God, upon the other.

6. "Moses prophesied, not only by his vocation, and his fidelity in that vocation, but also by his *testimony* (John v. 49) to the Son, the Apostle of the final salvation. None the less did the Old Testament house of God, in which Moses had the employment of a servant, *viz.,* the Old Testament Church, which had, as its central point, the 'tabernacle of testimony' (Acts vii. 44; Rev. xv. 5), with its typical furniture and administration, prophesy of the New Testament house of God, over which Christ is placed as

Son, *viz.*, the New Testament Church which has its central point in Christ, in whom God appeared incarnate, and in whom as antitype that tabernacling (σκήνωσις) of God among men which was prefigured in the Old Testament tabernacle (σκηνή), has thus been realized." DEL.

7. Christ is not, indeed, ashamed to call us His brethren; and He has in reality become truly man, and by circumcision has subjected Himself to the Jewish law (Gal. iv. 4), and become incorporated with the Israelite people of God. But in respect to the New Testament people of God, He is not a member, but Head and Lord. He is, indeed, "the first-born among many brethren" (Rom. viii. 29); and, by that completed and perfected life on which our Epistle lays special stress, holds a relationship to men who, by regeneration, become children of God, and becomes a type and pattern to all who are perfected through Him. But the expression "first-born" points to His relation to those who, after the resurrection, are perfected in the Messianic kingdom (ch. i. 5; Col. i. 18; Rev. i. 5). In His essential being, He is chief of the creation (Rev. iii. 14), and πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως (Col. i. 15). The attributes which are ascribed to the *Son* in the opening of our Epistle, forbid our assigning to this term, in the present section, any other signification than that He who, as Son of the Universal Founder, is elevated over the house of God, is essentially equal to Him, so that an *indirect proof* of the deity of Jesus Christ may be drawn from this passage.

8. While the mention of the fidelity of Jesus reminds us, indeed, of His *moral* perfection, and the comparison of His vocation with that of Moses, reminds us of His agency in *establishing* a new relation of man to God, in a new covenant and kingdom; while the mention, at the same time, of the filial nature and imperial dignity of Jesus Christ rises above and beyond the sphere of mere morality and natural religion; and the whole tenor of Scripture forbids our interpreting the language used in such a way as to favor the *subordinatian* and *Arian* heresy,—so, on the other hand, the declaration that God "made Him," and has "founded all things," precludes the interpretation which merges the Father in the Son, and yet lends no countenance to *Monarchianism* or *Unitarianism*.

9. "Calling" (κλῆσις) denotes not merely an invitation into the kingdom of God by means of preaching. To *this* conception of a "called" one (κλητός), as occurring in the parables of Jesus (Matth. xx. 16; xxii. 14), and there without doctrinal import, but simply standing in inseparable connection with the depicting of well-known usages and customs, corresponds in our Epistle, the term εὐηγγελισμένος, ch. iv. 2, or εὐαγγελθείς (ch. iv. 6). The κλητός, on the contrary, is, precisely as with Paul, one in whom the gracious call has been *made effectual*. He is one destined for the Messianic salvation (ch. i. 14), for the eternal inheritance (ch. ix. 15), which is the substance of the ἐπαγγελία, ch. vi. 17, has His citizenship in heaven, ch. xii. 23, and has been given by the Father to the Son, ch. ii. 13, and by a Divine act, in which the eternal purpose of grace realizes itself in time in the case of individuals, has become, by means of the preached Word, an actual member of the Church which is destined to eternal salvation. But since the Word of God works, not magically, but spiritually, and, as a condition of its saving efficacy, requires repentance and faith (as unfolded in the passage immediately following), steadfastness in a gracious state and the attainment of perfection, are secured by our imitation of the fidelity of Jesus Christ.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The duty of fidelity 1. in its *ground* and *reason* in our relation to God; 2. in its *extent* in the calling assigned to us; 3. in its *patterns* in the servant and in the Son of God; 4. in its *blessings*, in securing to us the joys of salvation: 5. in its *cultivation* within and by means of the Church.—Moses and Christ 1. in their *resemblance*, *a.* as sent of God; *b.* of unimpeached fidelity; *c.* in the aggregate nature of their vocation, as having reference to the establishment of the kingdom of God; 2. in their *diversity*, *a.* in position and office; *b.* in their nature and history; *c.* in their influence and the honor conferred upon them.—We are the house of God; 1. in what sense? 2. under what conditions? 3. with what obligations?—What in the confession of our faith have we principally to regard? That it be 1. true in its substance; 2. clear in its expression; 3. sure in its living power; 4. correct in its grounds; 5. adapted to its ultimate end.—If the hope of our calling is to be fulfilled in us, then 1. our calling must become effectual in us, *a.* in its heavenly character, *b.* under a gracious Divine influence, *c.* within the sphere of the Christian brotherhood; and 2. our hope must express, *a.* in its confidence, faith, *b.* in its glorying, a living power, *c.* in its steadfastness, the fidelity of the servants and children of God.—Even those who are placed highest among us should not cease to be 1. servants of the true God; 2. members of the house of God; 3. imitators of the Son of God.—Also the humblest among us must not forget 1. that God has founded and established all things, and 2. that they are partakers of a heavenly calling.—The beginning in Christianity is harder than the beginning in any earthly work; yet the beginning in Christianity is easier than steadfast perseverance to the end.—Complain not of God if thou hast no hope of salvation, but murmur 1. against thine unbelief in the heavenly calling: 2. against thine unfaithfulness in the service committed to thee; 3. against thy negligence in using the gracious means of salvation.—The blessings of Christian church-fellowship and life, correspond in the Divine arrangements 1. to the tasks which we have to fulfil; 2. to the dangers which threaten us; 3. to our essential needs.—The confession, whose obligation rests upon us, urges us 1. to a joyful faith which we are unanimously to profess; 2. to a holy love which we are fraternally to exercise; 3. to a blessed hope which we are faithfully to maintain unto the end.—We are called 1. by a heavenly calling; 2. into a holy fellowship; 3. to the inheritance of the Son of God.

BERLENBURGER BIBLE:—Stability of doctrine takes the lead; to this, therefore, stability on our part must be added, not from our own

powers, but from grace. We must look to it that we do not fall from our own steadfastness (2 Pet. iii. 17). In this we should place the glory of our religion.

STARKE:—That which was required to be said, and actually is said of the ways of God, demands to be heard, and received with faith. Blessed, therefore, are ye who hear and keep the word of God (Luke xi. 29).—What avails it to have begun in the spirit and to end in the flesh? The end crowns the work.—It is a great dignity of believers that they are, and are called the house of God. Angels are called, indeed, thrones (Col. i. 16), but never the house of God; but believers are so named, alike on account of the *essential*, and on account of the *gracious* presence of God, by which He dwells in them. This house, Jesus Christ as the true light, illuminates by virtue of His prophetic office; He sanctifies it by virtue of His high-priestly office, whence it is called (1 Pet. ii. 5) a spiritual house; He maintains and protects it by virtue of His kingly office. But as He dwells in this house so is He also its foundation upon which it is built (1 Cor. iii. 11; Eph. ii. 20; 1 Pet. ii. 6).

LAURENTIUS:—Believers may take courage; they are the house and temple of God.—In faith firmness is requisite.

VON BOGATZKY:—But believers, even the most dull-eyed, see that they cannot too much trust in our God, and cannot so much hope in Him that they do not always need to arouse themselves still more, to this confidence and this hope. For there are always many things which would fain take from us confidence, faith, and hope; therefore should we hold all fast, and in such trust and such hope, not allow even our short-comings to render us weak and unstable.

STEINHOFER: —Faith and the confession of faith before God and men, are the *two* things demanded of a Christian in the Gospel of the new covenant (Rom. x. 4).—By *faith* we come, really to a blessed enjoyment of grace, and to an essential communion with the Father and with the Son, our Lord Jesus Christ; and by the *confession* of this faith, we come, at the same time, into the joint partnership of those who have received the like precious faith, and have Jesus as their Lord and Head.—From all that transpires in the house of God we may discover that the eternal Son, whom the whole creation has got to recognize as its Creator and Lord, is in especial the God and Lord of sinners.—O Thou who art faithfulness, make us faithful to Thee!

HAHN:—He who has directed his look toward Christ will have ample encouragement to fidelity, and will all the more look to it that it be not found wanting in him.—The faithfulness of all the servants of Christ is but a weak and shadowy image of the faithfulness of Christ our Lord.

RIEGER:—As an apostle, Jesus has brought to us the testimony of God, as High-Priest; He manages our cause with God; and faith recognizes Him, or accepts Him for that for which He has been made unto us of God. Confidence, and the glorying of hope, are the bands by which this house, this divine race, are united with its head, and the call to one faith, and to one hope of their calling, unites also among one another these members of the household, provided only they hold fast to their profession.—STIER:—That house of God, wherein Moses is called faithful, was only the forecourt and the beginning of the structure which only appears entirely completed in Christ.—FRICKE:—With the coming of Christ the house of God appears completed; all is ready; we need only to enter in; but if we enter in, we shall be ourselves (1 Pet. ii. 5) living stones in this house.

[OWEN:—That men be *brethren*, properly and strictly, it is required that they have one father, be of one family, and be equally interested in the privileges and advantages thereof. The saint's calling is *heavenly*, 1. from *the fountain and principal cause* of it; 2. in respect of *the means* whereby it is wrought, which are spiritual and heavenly (the word and the Spirit, both from above); 3. of the *end*, which is *to* heaven and heavenly things, wherein lies the *hope* of our calling. All true and real professors of the Gospel are sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and made truly and really holy.—No man comes into a useful, saving knowledge of Jesus Christ in the Gospel, but by virtue of an effectual, heavenly calling.—The spiritual mysteries of the Gospel, especially those which concern the person and offices of Christ, require deep, diligent and attentive consideration.—Solomon's merchants would not have gone to Ophir had there not been gold there as well as apes and peacocks.—The business of God with sinners could be no way transacted but by the negotiation and embassy of the Son. It was necessary that God's Apostle unto sinners should, in the whole discharge of His office, be furnished with *a full comprehension of the whole mind of God*, as to the affair committed to Him. Now, this never any was, nor ever can be capable of, but only Jesus Christ, the Son of God.—Truths to be believed are like believers themselves; all their life, power, and order consist in their relation unto Christ; separated from Him they are dead and useless.—The builders of the New Testament church are *servants*; (1.) they act by virtue of *commission*, from Him who is the only Lord and ruler of it: (2.) it is required of them as servants, *to observe and obey the commands of their Lord*; (3.) as servants they are *accountable*; (4.) as servants they shall have their *reward*.—It is an eminent privilege to be the house of Christ, or a part of it; "Whose house are we."—Although these "living stones" are continually removed, some from the lower rooms in this house in grace to the higher stories in glory, yet not one stone of it is, or shall be lost for ever.—*Interest in the Gospel* gives sufficient cause of confidence and rejoicing in every condition.].

II.

The threatening of the Old Testament, that unbelievers shall not enter into the rest of God, is all the more to be taken to heart by the New Testament people of God.

Chapter III. 7-19.

7 Wherefore, as the Holy Spirit saith: To-day if ye will [*om.* will] hear his voice,
8 harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilder-
9 ness, when [where οὗ] your fathers tempted me, proved me [by proving],[1] and saw my
10 works [during] forty years. Wherefore I was grieved [was angry] with that [this][2]
generation, and said, They do always err [go astray] in their heart; and they have
11 not known [but they did not know] my ways. So I sware in my wrath, They shall
12 not enter into my rest. Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart
13 of unbelief, in departing [falling away, ἀποστῆναι] from the living God. But exhort
14 one another daily, while it is called To-day; lest any of you[3] be hardened through
the deceitfulness of sin. For we are made [have become] partakers of Christ, if
[provided that, ἐάν περ] we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the
15 end; while it is said, To-day if ye will hear [if ye hear] his voice, harden not your
16 hearts, as in the provocation. For some, when they had heard, did provoke, [for who,
when they heard, provoked him?]: howbeit not all [nay, did not all they?] that came
17 out of Egypt by Moses [?]. But [And] with whom was he grieved [angry during]
forty years? *was* it not with them that had sinned [?], whose carcases fell in the wil-
18 derness? [!] And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to
19 them that believed not [disobeyed, ἀπειθήσασιν]? So [And] we see that they could not
enter in because of unbelief.

[1] Ver. 9.—For *ἐπείρασαν με οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν, ἐδοκίμασάν με*, recent critics read after Sin. A. B. C. D.* E. M. Uff., 73, 127, Ital. Copt., *ἐπείρασαν οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ*. The *lect. recept.* is made up from the LXX. Cod. Alex. in which the first and the Vat. in which the second *με* is wanting.

[2] Ver. 10.—For *τῇ γενεᾷ ἐκείνῃ*, we are to read with Sin. A. B. D. M., 6, 17, *τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ*, [*this*, not *that* (*ἐκείνῃ*) the author, as supposed by many, changing the pronoun for the sake of a more direct application to his readers. This view, however, is rejected by Moll—K.].

[3] Ver. 13.—Instead of *τις ἐξ ὑμῶν*, read with B. D. E. K. L., 46, 48, *ἐξ ὑμῶν τις*. Sin., however, has the former reading.

[Ver. 7.—*ὡς*, *as*, *καθώς*, *according as*—*ἐὰν ἀκούσητε*, not, "if ye will hear," but, "if ye hear," or "shall have heard." See Del., De W., Moll. Still the precise import of the Hebrew original of the Psalm is doubtful, and it is possible that the Septuagint may intend its *ἐὰν ἀκούσητε* as having an *optative* force—*would that!* Yet we do not seem authorized in our Epistle to depart from the natural rendering of the words.

Ver. 9.—*οὗ*, *where*, not *when*, as Eng. ver.—*ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ*, *in proving*, instead of *ἐδοκίμασαν*.

Ver. 10.—*αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν αὐτοί*, emphatic; "but *they* did not know," *etc.*, to be coördinated apparently not with *πλανῶνται*, but with *εἶπον* and *δέ*, adversative. So De W., Del., Moll.

Ver. 11.—*ὡς ὤμοσα*, Eng. ver., *so* I swore as if *ὡς*=*οὕτως*. Moll, *so that*—*ὥστε*; so De Wette, Del. Bib. Union, literally, *as*.

Ver. 14.—*γεγόναμεν*, *we have become*, not *are made*, *ἐάνπερ*, *precisely if*—provided that: stronger than *ἐάν*, *if*.

Ver. 16.—*τινες γάρ*, *for who?* all modern scholars read *τίνες*, *who?* instead of the ancient *τινές*, *some*, indefinite, which is nearly unmeaning.

Ver. 17.—*ὧν τὰ κῶλα*—*ἐρήμῳ*. Moll rightly follows Del. in making this not a question, but a statement descriptive of the effects of the wrath. So Bib. Un.

Ver. 18.—*Καί*, Eng. ver., *so*, without reason. It is not an *inference*, but the statement of an actual fact. De Wette, Del., Moll, Bib. Union rightly *and*.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 7. **Wherefore as the Holy Ghost saith**, *etc.*—The exhortation to take warning from the example of their ancestors against apostasy is introduced by *διό*, as an inference from the preceding statements, and is to be conceived as corresponding (*καθώς*) to the address of the Holy Spirit; *Διό*, however, is neither to be immediately connected with *σκληρύνετε*, (Schlicht., Ebr., Del., *etc.*), thus producing a blending of the principal with the subordinate sentence; inasmuch as God, in the citation, vv. 7–11, is speaking in the first person; nor with *βλέπετε*, ver. 12 (Erasm., Calv., Este, Grot., Bl., Lün., Bisping, *etc.*), for this stands too remote. Nor again is the hortatory addition to be supplied (Thol., De W.); but the abrupt breaking off of the construction in the main sentence is *characteristic*. It gives to the reader a moment's interval of repose, and yet, at the same time, summons him to reflection, and to a right application of the passage. With new emphasis, and starting, as it were, afresh, the exhortation is subsequently given by the author himself in ver. 12.

Ver. 8. **To-day, if ye hear his voice, harden not your hearts.**—As the Sept. often translates the Hebrew particle of *desire* by *ἐάν*, it is possible that it has so taken the words here according to the *common understanding* of the

Hebrew text, in which אִם stands first for the sake of emphasis: "Would that to-day ye might hearken to His voice!" It is possible, however, that אִם in Heb. here simply introduces a hypothetical condition [so Delitzsch]. The citation is from Ps. xcv. 7, 11, which, by the sudden introduction of the speech of Jehovah, belongs to the class of those that bear a prophetic character. The author is thus entirely warranted in not restricting the "to-day" to the actual 'present' of the Psalmist (left in Heb. unnamed—in the Sept. mentioned as David); and in regarding the address itself as that of the Holy Spirit, while, at the same time, the Holy Scripture is regarded in all its parts as *θεόπνευστος* (2 Tim. iii. 16). DEL. communicates the following remarkable Messianic Haggada from *bab. Sanhedrin*, 98 *a.*: "R. Joshua Ben Levi once found Elijah (the Tishbite) standing at the entrance of the cave of R. Simeons Ben Jochei. He asked him: 'Do I come into the future world?' Elijah answered: If the Lord (אֲדוֹן, name of the Shechina that was invisibly present with Elijah) wills it. R. Joshua stated that he saw indeed but two (himself and Elijah), but he heard the voices of three. He asked him further: When comes the Messiah? Elijah: Go and ask Him in person. Joshua: And where? Elijah: He is sitting at the gate of Rome. Joshua: And how may He be recognized? Elijah: He is sitting among poor persons laden with diseases; and while others unbind their wounds *at the same time*, and then bind them up, He unbinds and then again binds up *one wound after another*, for He thinks: Perchance I am about to be summoned (called to make my public appearance); and I do this that I may not then be detained! (as would be the case if He unbound all wounds at the same time). Then came Joshua to Him, and He cried: Peace unto thee, son of Levi! Joshua: When comest Thou, Lord? He: To-day. On returning to Elijah, Joshua was asked by him: What said He to thee? Joshua: Peace unto thee, son of Levi. Elijah: In this He has given to thee and to thy father a prospect of the future world. Joshua: But He has deceived me in that He said to me that He comes to-day. Elijah: His meaning in that was this—To-day, if ye hear His voice."

VER. 8. **As in the provocation in the wilderness.**—The Heb. reads: As at Meribah (Numb. xx.), as at the day of Massa, in the wilderness (Ex. xvii.). Our author takes these proper names etymologically, as *appellatives*, and the words *κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ πειρασμοῦ* as added to define the time of the *ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ*. The *κατά* is a particle of time, the same as at ch. ix. 9, as in the Hellenistic, and is not to be turned into a term of *comparison=ὡς*. Otto considers that here also Numb. xiv. is alone referred to.

VER. 9. **Where your fathers—during forty years.**—The last mentioned temptation took place in the *first* year of the Exodus; the first mentioned in the *fortieth*. But the hardness of the people always remained the same, to which Moses refers, Deut. xxxiii. 8. The *οὗ* is a particle of *place* corresponding to אֲשֶׁר, and not, by attraction to *πειρασμοῦ*, Gen. for *ᾧ*, *with which* (Erasm., Schmid, Beng., Peirce). The forty years in the wilderness are in the synagogue also regarded as typical. R. ELIESER says: "The days of the Messiah are forty years, as it is said, Ps. xcv." (*Sanh.*, fol. 99, 1). And to the question: How long continue the years of the Messiah? R. AKIBA answered: "Forty years, corresponding to the sojourning of the Israelites in the desert" (*Tanchuma*, fol. 79, 4). The admonition of our Epistle must, therefore, have made a powerful impression, if this number of years since the ministry of Christ had, when this Epistle was composed, nearly elapsed. That the author has in mind this typical relation, is clear from the fact that the 'forty years,' which in the Heb. belong to the following clause—a construction which he himself recognizes at ver. 17—he here carries back to the preceding, and shows that he *intends* this construction by introducing between the dissevered parts the particle *διό* (so Intpp. generally since Calov).

VER. 10. **Wherefore I was angry with this generation.**—The Hellenistic *προσοχθίζειν* from *ὀχθή*, *steep, high bank*, or *cliff*, implies violent, tempestuous excitement, which one either occasions or experiences. Usually it has the latter sense, denoting the feeling of violent displeasure awakened by opposition. The *ἀεί* belongs not to *εἶπον* (Erasm.), but to *πλανῶνται*. A secondary idea of contempt can hardly belong to *γενεά* (Heinr., Steng.), though very possibly to *ταύτῃ* (Lün.); but it is impossible that, by the latter pronoun (*ταύτῃ*), instead of *ἐκείνῃ*, the author could have intended in this connection an incidental reference to his readers (Böhm., Bl., De W.). In this passage also the author follows the Alex. Cod. of the Sept. in reading *αὐτοὶ δέ*, while the Vat. Cod. follows the Heb. in reading *καὶ αὐτοί*.

VER. 11. **As I sware in my wrath that they shall not enter into my rest.**—Possibly *ὡς* should be taken as=*as*, but it may also, corresponding to the Heb. אֲשֶׁר (Ewald, § 337, *a.*), denote *result=ὥστε, so that*. It then, indeed, usually takes the Infin., or the Opt. with *ἄν*, though sometimes also the Indic. (WIN., p. 410) [*Ὥστε, so that*, as easily takes the Ind. as the Opt.—K.]. The *εἰ* in the clause containing the substance of the oath, is in imitation of the Heb. אִם. The formula has sprung from the suppression of the *apodosis*, and negatives the thought, while אִם לֹא *affirms* it. The *κατάπαυσις* refers originally to the *rest* of the Promised Land, Deut. xii. 9, 10. But the idea of the "rest of God," proceeding from this starting point, acquired a wider scope and a deeper significance.

VER. 12. **Take heed that there be not—living God.**—*Μή*, after words of *seeing*, in the Fut. Indic., expresses not only a warning, but, with it, anxiety in regard to a failure to give heed (HART., *Part.* II., 140). The enclitic *ποτέ* means, not *ever, at any time* (Beza, Eng. Ver., *etc.*), but *perchance*, and the *ἐν τινι ὑμῶν* individualizes the admonition, so as to bring it home to each person in conscientious self-examination. The Gen. *ἀπιστίας* indicates the relation of *quality;* the evil heart, then, is not to be re-

garded as the *cause* or *ground* (Bl., *etc.*), nor as the *consequence* of unbelief (De W., *etc.*). Nor, again, is ἀπιστία either *faithlessness* or *disobedience* (Schultz). The latter is the consequence of unbelief, iii. 18; iv. 6, 11, which appears here as exhibiting its internal essence in apostasy from God. We are not by θεός to understand Christ (Gerh., Dorsch, Calov, Sebast. Schmidt, Schöttg., Carpz.), although the warning refers to the lapse from Christianity to Judaism. And God is here called ζῶν, *living*, not in contrast with dead works of law, vi. 1; ix. 14 (Bl.), and not in contrast with dead idols, as Acts xiv. 15; 2 Cor. vi. 16; 1 Thess. i. 9 (Böhme), but as He who works with living efficiency, ix. 14; xii. 22; who executes His threats, x. 31; but chiefly who has appointed Christ as He did Moses, and thus accomplished the fulfilment of His promises. This latter point is overlooked by most interpreters, but is involved directly both in the fundamental conception of our Epistle, and in the immediate connection of the passage.

Ver. 13. **But exhort one another daily—sins.**—With the warning stands connected a summons to παράκλησις, *i. e.*, to language at once of consolation and of admonition, with which the hearers are to render daily aid to one another, so long as this period of gracious waiting shall continue. In classical, as well as in New Testament use (Col. iii. 16) ἑαυτούς, is frequently =ἀλλήλους. Individual self-exhortation cannot be expressed by παρακαλεῖτε ἑαυτούς, which would rather demand παρακαλείτω ἕκαστος ἑαυτόν. Τὸ σήμερον (to-day with the def. art.) cannot denote the life-time of individuals (Theodoret, Theoph., Primas., Erasm., Este, Dorsch, *etc.*), but must be identical with the day of the Psalm, and thus with the interval of grace extending to the second coming of the Messiah. We might also, in this sense, translate καλεῖται, *is named*, (Vulg., Est., Bl., Lün., *etc.*), but inasmuch as this is liable to the misconception: So long as we can yet speak of 'to-day,' the rendering *is called*=so long as the 'to-day' of the Psalm sounds in our ears (Calv., Thol., Böhm., Del., *etc.*), would seem to deserve the preference. The Aor. Pass. σκληρυνθῇ is not to be softened down; it contains a reminder of the divine judicial hardening of those who abuse the means of grace through the deceitfulness of sin. For this reason ἐξ ὑμῶν is designedly placed before τίς, not as contrasting them with their fathers in the wilderness (Böhme, Bl.), which would almost necessarily require a καί, *also*, but to designate with emphasis the readers as those who are highly favored (Del.). *Apostasy from Christianity* is here designated as "sin," absolutely; for the essence of sin is apostasy from God; but Christ is the Son of God, and has brought to its accomplishment the will of God on earth. The *deceit*, therefore, which now works upon the heart, is worse than the earlier, Gen. iii. 13.

Ver. 14. **For we have become joint partakers with Christ if we hold fast,** *etc.*—As in the former chapter the author now again enforces the preceding exhortation by the greatness of the salvation which has been bestowed on us. The term γεγόναμεν, *have become*, reminds us that we do not possess this salvation nature, and that consequently without the observance of the requisite condition, we are liable to have it withdrawn from us. This condition, again, introduced by the particle [not of *mere* condition εἰ with opt., but] of *doubt*, ἐάν, *if*, ἐάνπερ, *precisely if*, *provided that* (with Subj.) is presented not simply and *objectively*, as a mere condition, but as of *questionable* fulfilment, and hence enforces the need of self-examination, of watchfulness, and of fidelity. And for this reason μέτοχοι τοῦ χριστοῦ cannot mean *participants of Christ*, *i. e.*, having part in His *person;* but only participants *along with Christ*, associates of, or joint partakers with Christ in the possessions and blessings of the kingdom of God. Riehm, overlooking this requirement of the context, prefers, with more recent scholars, the rendering *participes*, *sharers in*, instead of *associates*, or *sharers with*, as the more comprehensive and significant. He is right, indeed, as to the matter of fact, where he says (II. 719): "Christ, the Mediator of the New Covenant, enters into such intimate. personal fellowship with the believer, that it can be said of the latter that he *possesses* Christ; and along with Christ Himself all that Christ has obtained has also become his own; as one who has part *in* Christ, he has also part *with* Christ in the heavenly glory and blessedness." But the context demands the limitation above given. The term must imply partners or associates of Christ, yet without its being referred back, as by Schultz, to the term "brethren" of Christ (ch. ii. 11); and the term μέτοχοι being narrowed down to ἀδελφοί. By ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως Erasm., Schultz, Stein, *etc.*, understand the settled elementary principles or foundations of the Christian religion. Luther renders it "the commenced or inaugurated essence"—*angefangene Wesen* (as translation of *substantia*). Vatablus, Este, Bisping make it a periphrasis for *faith*, in so far as faith produces our *subsistence* in the spiritual life, or originates the subsistence of Christ within us. Instead of either of these meanings, the context points us to a meaning of ὑπόστασις familiar to the later Greek, *viz.*, *firm confidence*, as the only one which meets its exigencies. For ὑπόστασις stands here in the same connection as ἐλπίς, *hope*, ver. 6, and in fact denotes this hope in its relation as daughter of faith, and by virtue of its relationship remaining amidst all assaults steadfastly and confidently directed toward the goal. As such it needs perpetual fostering and culture, in order that that beginning of the Christian career, which is wont to be characterized by joyfulness, energy and strength (1 Tim. v. 12; Rev. ii. 4), and which, in the case of the readers, has been so characterized (ch. vi. 10; x. 32; xiii. 7), may have a corresponding end. The ἀρχὴ τῆς ὑποστάσεως is, therefore, a *beginning*, not in the sense of imperfection and weakness, which led Ebrard to find in the readers a set of catechumens and neophytes, but the opening or inauguration of the Church life in its full vitality and power (Camero, Grot., Böhme, Thol., *etc.*).

Ver. 15. **In its being said to-day if ye hear—harden not,** *etc.*—The author resumes the citation, yet not for the purpose of expressing an *admonition*, thus making the citation proper extend only to "to-day" (v. Gerl.), or to "hear His voice" (Capell., Carpz., *etc.*), and the author

resume his exhortation at "harden not," *etc.*, in the *applied* words of the Psalm, as the answering clause to ἐν τῷ λέγ. For this formula of introduction makes it necessary to take the following words as an entire citation. Nor may we again (with Beng., Michael., *etc.*), enclose ver. 14 in parenthesis, and connect ἐν τῷ λέγ. immediately with the requisition (παρακαλεῖτε, *etc.*), ver. 13; for the verse thus forms not merely an unnecessary and halting appendage, but unnaturally and absurdly summons the readers to mutual admonition by the previous utterance of the words of the Psalm. Nor may we (with Chrys., Grot., *etc.*), take vv. 16–19 parenthetically, and connect ἐν τῷ λέγ., with iv. 1; a construction forbidden alike by the subsequent course of thought, and the connecting particle οὖν. Nor may we attach ver. 15 directly to ver. 14; thus either assigning the *mode of procedure* by which steadfastness of faith is to be maintained (Vulg., Luth., Calv.), or the *reason and necessity* of maintaining it in order that we may be partakers with Christ (Ebr.). For ἐν τῷ λέγ. is not=διὸ λέγει, or οὕτως γὰρ εἴρηκεν. Better, therefore, to take the words in question as *protasis*, or conditioning clause to ver. 16, which latter verse is then to be taken as interrogative with an interposed γάρ=*for, why*, (according to genuine Greek usage) to which also the ἀλλά corresponds (Seml., and most recent interpreters). [This last construction is undoubtedly possible; and I believe it preferable to either of the others, except that which would connect it with ch. iv. 1, as held by Chrys., Grotius and others. In this case, however, it is not a case of proper *parenthesis*, so that iv. 1 would stand in regular construction with iii. 15. Rather as the author was about to proceed to the train of thought, ch. iv. 1, he was led, especially by the language of the quotation itself, to restate sharply and distinctly what had been previously but implied and hinted at, the *actual crime* and the *actual punishment* of the ancient Israelites, from which so weighty admonitions were drawn. He, therefore, abruptly breaks off in the middle of his sentence, to introduce in a series of sharp interrogations and statements these ideas: which being accomplished, he returns,—with a natural *change of construction*, occasioned by the long interposed passage,—to the idea which at iii. 15, he had started to develope. This obviates entirely the objection drawn from the particle οὖν, iv. 1, and the otherwise *anacoluthic* character of the construction, and is, in my judgment, the only solution of the problem of ver. 15, that is not attended by nearly insuperable difficulties. The construction, therefore, which I prefer, is decidedly that of Chrys., in a somewhat *modified* form.—K.]. Of course τίνες must then be taken interrogatively; and the author's purpose is either to repel the idea, that perhaps there were only a *portion* who were guilty of the provocation, *to wit*, the people who were at the time at Meribah and Massa (Böhme, Ebr.); in which case the author would reply that *all* Israel failed to enter into the Promised Land, for the reason that the whole people were guilty of the sin of unbelief and apostasy; or he designs to emphasize the fact that it was precisely *Israel*, the highly favored people, that had been conducted forth from Egypt to become God's special possession, in whom all this had taken place (Del.). I see no reason for separating the two ideas. For while ἀκούσαντες points to the *prerogative*, which they enjoyed who *heard* the word of God, and the attendant obligation to obedience, the next and following interrogative sentence, ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες, brings into closest connection (in πάντες) the *universality* of the sin, and in ἐξελθόντες, the preceding gracious experience and privilege: [while διὰ Μωυσέως suggests here the same contrast between Moses, and his relation to the ancient Theocracy and Christ, as δι' ἀγγέλων, ch. i. 2, between the *angels* and Christ.—K.].

Bisping remarks: "yet perchance not all?" but erroneously. For οὐ in interrogations=*nonne*, has always an affirmative force (KÜHNER, II., 579; HART., *Part.*, II., 88). The exceptional cases of Joshua, Caleb and those of tender age, are not of a nature to detract from the truth thus broadly stated, and to require that τίνες be taken, as it generally was before Bengel, *indefinitely* (τινές, *some*, instead of τίνες, *who?*) thus giving the rendering (Erasm., Luth., Eng. ver., *etc.*), "for some, when they heard committed provocation, but not all those who came out of Egypt by Moses." How could the 600,000 whom Moses brought out of Egypt, be called τινές? The rendering of Bengel, Schultz, Kuinoel; "Nay, only they who," *etc.* "It was merely they who," [as if denying an assertion that certain men indeed provoked God, but it was not those who came out of Egypt, *etc.*, to which the author replies, "Nay, they were all those=they were *none but* those] would require the article οἱ before πάντες, in order to give clearly a *predicative* character to οἱ ἐξελθόντες. [But this οἱ would scarcely mend the matter, and Bengel's construction would then be little less harsh than it is now].

VER. 17. **With whom was he angry—wilderness.**—Most recent interpreters put the second interrogative mark, or still a third one, at the close of the period, after "wilderness," to avoid the heavy and dragging effect of the last clause—if without an interrogation. But this construction overlooks the parallelism with vv. 18, 19, which, in like manner, distribute themselves into three members. For the last clause of these latter verses is not a mere continuation of the facts previously stated; but it points to the *fulfilment* of the Divine oath, lying before our eyes, in the exclusion of the people from Canaan through unbelief. So also in ver. 17 the last clause, "whose carcasses," points to the manifestation of the Divine wrath, in the fact that those who had fallen away from God, dying, as it were, gradually, during their bodily life, became walking *corpses* (Del.). Grotius says rightly *ex historia cognoscimus*, while Seb. Schmidt, followed by Bl., with most later-interpreters, maintains; βλέπομεν, *non de lectione aut cognitione historiæ, sed de convictione animi e disputatione, seu doctrina præmissa.* [That is, Seb. Schmidt, Bl., *etc.*, followed by Alford, regard ver. 19, "And we see that they could not," *etc.*, as an *inference*, the result of a chain of reasoning, of which, however, it is very difficult to trace any previous links; while Del. and Moll, following Grotius, make it the *result* stated as well known and

clearly seen in the pages of the historical record, and thus brought up as a *historical fact* to enforce the positions of the author, and so the clause, "whose carcasses fell in the wilderness," stands related to what precedes. It is the author's statement, in Scripture language, of the results of the wrath of God.—K.]. The history of Israel is typical, and to this and to the state of things which follows from it, the author is referring (as shown immediately by the commencement of the following chapter), not drawing *conclusions* from previous premises.—Κῶλα, *members*, particularly hands and feet, is the term by which the LXX. render the Heb. פְּגָרִים in the sense of *bodies* or *corpses*.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. "Our being kept unto salvation, springs from the promised and vouchsafed power of God, yet only through faith, which does not waver or draw back (ch. x. 38, 39; 1 Pet. i. 5); and thus the Apostle has in these words expressed in the most definite manner the theme of his exhortation. In his purpose to carry it out still further, he again lays hold, with the skilful hand of a master, upon the word of the early Scriptures, and says what he has to say to the brethren, the partakers of the heavenly calling, in the words of the Holy Spirit, by the mouth of David. For the Epistle to the Hebrews is in so far analogous to the Revelation of John, as it brings into close union the two Testaments, and sets forth the profoundest and ultimate elements of New Testament truths, as a proper fulfilment of the types and preparatory institutions of the Old Testament, as the innermost sense and spirit of the ancient word, which was written beforehand wholly for the fulness of times" (Stier).

2. With the *doctrine of predestination* in all its forms, this section stands in decided antagonism; for the author speaks indeed of a hardening, which has for its result, the *non-attainment of the promised rest;* and in like manner of a *Divine will and work* which are herein accomplished. But this is by no means referred to any *original* wrath of God, or to His eternal counsel. Rather it is the *deceitfulness of sin*, by which the obduracy is produced, and against this is directed an earnest warning. The wrath of God appears as the holy fire of righteous indignation upon those who, in consequence of their evil heart of unbelief, have fallen away from the living God, and have provoked and tempted Him, before that He could prove Himself unfaithful, and fail of His own word. And it is *unbelief* that is emphatically declared to have been the cause of the hardening of the heart, and, as united with *disobedience*, to have been the ground of the destruction of those who fell in the wilderness. But that unbelief itself is not purposed or produced of God, and that the *capacity* to believe in the preached word is not refused by God to individual men, or taken from them previously to their own self-determination, is clear from the earnestness of the exhortation that each one should, during the gracious season of his pilgrimage, give heed to the preached word, and not allow himself to be hardened against it, but rather, by the influence of mutual admonitions within the Church, should incite himself to lay to heart the history of the Israelites, and to an unwavering maintenance of the confidence of faith. [That nothing is said here of the doctrine of predestination, proves nothing more against it than is proved by every passage of warning or exhortation in the New Testament. Few Calvinists believe that the doctrine of predestination is incompatible with the free agency and consequent accountability of man.—K.].

3. The *hardening* of the heart has its gradations of carnal security, which comforts itself with the outward possession of the means of grace, and from natural indifference and insensibility to the word, proceeds on through unbelieving disparagement, faithless neglect, and reckless transgression of the word, to rejection, contempt, and denial of it, and thence to a permanent embittering of the wicked heart; to a conscious stubbornness of the wicked will; to the bold tempting of the living God Himself, until, in complete obduracy, judicial retribution begins the fulfilment of its terrible work.

4. *Unbelief* is, in its inmost essence, *faithlessness* and *apostasy*, and hence always manifests itself as *disobedience* and *corruption*. In outward corruption the Divine judgment brings the inward depravity, the πονηρία, to light, and, at the same time, to its due reward. For God, in contrast with the faithless and apostate, remains true to Himself and His word, and as the living God carries His judgment through all resistance of the world and the devil, to victory; bringing His threats, as well as His promises, to gradual, but sure and unchecked accomplishment.

5. It is God's will indeed that all men be saved, and this will is potent and mighty; yet as a *gracious will*, it exercises no compulsion, while, as the will of the *living* God, it renders possible the fulfilment of the indispensable conditions of salvation; and, as the will of the Holy God, works not magically, but by the ordinary means of grace. The decision of our destiny is thus entrusted to *our own will*, since God has in a reliable way made known to us our destination to salvation, and provided and proffered the sure means for its attainment.

6. The duty of *self-examination*, and of the *conscientious use* of the means of grace, we must never lose sight of; since we have not as yet entered into rest, but are merely on the way to the goal. If our *gracious* fellowship with Christ is completely to triumph over our *natural* fellowship with our fathers, it must be nurtured and promoted in the way that God has ordained. Otherwise the end will not correspond with the beginning. For previous obedience excuses not subsequent apostasy, and a faith that has been abandoned does not justify at the Divine tribunal.

7. Since the gracious will of God aims at the salvation of men; while with some His judgments only produce obduracy, as the punishment of unbelief, and in consequence of this, exclusion from salvation; and since to every individual a period of grace is allotted whose limit is unknown, we must suppose that grace has, up to this point, applied in sufficient measure all its means, ways, and resources, and that God, by

virtue of His omniscience, has determined this point of time in which the work of grace ceases. But with *obdurate hardness*, sin passes over into a permanent condition.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Our life is a pilgrimage, if: 1, our goal is entrance into the rest of God; 2, our companions the people of God; 3, our Leader the Spirit of God; 4, our rule the word of God; 5, our Helper the Son of God.—Believers have chiefly to guard themselves: 1, against false security in faith; 2, against arrogance and boasting of faith; 3, against wanderings and backsliding from faith. —How exceedingly important that the season of grace be not neglected: 1, we know not the moment at which our gracious reprieve is ended; 2, they who neglect, incur the sure wrath of God; 3, they who walk under the wrath of God do not come into the land of promise.—We must hearken to the voice of the Holy Spirit as it speaks to us: 1, in the Holy Scripture; 2, in our own conscience; 3, from the mouth of converted brethren.—He who does to-day what God demands, has best cared for to-morrow; and he who does this daily, in *the to-day* gains eternity. —In self-examination we have particularly to take heed to our heart: 1, whether it is an erring heart, or one steadfast in the faith; 2, whether it is an evil heart, or one converted to God; 3, whether it is a presumptuous heart, or one that is led in the discipline of the Holy Spirit.—Why deception through sin is the most dangerous: 1, because it most frequently occurs, and is most rarely corrected; 2, because it is most easily accomplished, and brings the heaviest losses.—To sin all times and ways are alike, but grace has its ordained means, and its limited times; therefore be warned aright, and then in turn warn others.—How can any one be lost in the possession of the means of grace? 1, if he does not use the means of grace which are proffered to him; 2, if his use of the means of grace is in truth an abuse; 3, if he does not perseveringly continue the right use of the means of grace unto the end.—Let us practice the duty of mutual watching and exhortation: 1, on the basis of the word of God; 2, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit; 3, as members of the people of God in a common lowliness; 4, from the hearty compassion of genuine brotherly love; 5, for mutual furtherance in faith and obedience toward the Lord our God.

STARKE:—Let every one see to it that he rightly avail himself of to-day, *i. e.*, of the present time; for this alone is ours, since the past is already gone, and the future is still uncertain. Besides, if the present is properly employed, it brings with it a blessing for the future (Gal. vi. 10; Isa. lv. 6).—The examples of the wicked stand in the Holy Scripture for our improvement (1 Cor. x. 6). There is no better means to be employed against obduracy of heart, than that by frequent self-examination and befitting fidelity, we learn to obey the convictions that have been wrought within us; for thus conscience maintains its tender sensibility, and is preserved from all hardening, 2 Cor. xiii. 5.—The more proofs and testimonies men have of the guidance and care of God, the heavier becomes the sin, if they will still neither believe nor hope, Matth. xxiii. 37, 38.—God has come to the aid of human weakness, and uttered in His word many a declaration with the virtual confirmation of an oath, in that He swears by Himself and appeals to the inviolable truth of His being and life.—Divine threatenings are not an empty and dead sound, but have a mighty emphasis; they are fraught with God's jealous zeal, and are finally put in force. Ah! that thou mightest be awakened by them to repentance! Josh. xxiii. 15; Zech. i. 6.—Man departs from God, and becomes involved in spiritual death, when he begins to deny the truths which bring salvation (Acts xiii. 46); or to live in conscious and deliberate sins, which are incompatible with union with God.—Oh! how necessary that the whole Christian body be aroused! but who thinks thereupon? We avoid speaking of spiritual things in our common intercourse; and this is a sure sign of a great backsliding.—Preachers cannot do every thing, and cannot be everywhere; therefore, the fathers of the household must be also bishops of the household; nay, one Christian must be bishop to another, and he has good authority and right to rebuke and correct in another what he sees worthy of reproof (1 Thess. v. 11; Jas. v. 19).—A man can easily be hardened if he does not take knowledge and care of himself, and take to heart the admonition of others.—Sin is a powerful and deceitful thing; powerful in evil desires, by which one is very easily swept away when he does not, with the grace of God, set himself against them; but deceitful when by the plausible assurance that a thing is right, allowable, and free from peril, it ensnares the man, seduces him into sin, and, unawares, gets the mastery of him. Ah! let every one be on his guard against it (Eph. iv. 22).—Christ, with all His attributes, offices, and possessions, belongs to us; for us was He born, for us He died, for us He arose, for us He lives, and for us He intercedes. Therefore, if we have Christ, we are wanting in no good whatsoever (Ps. xxxiv. 11; Rom. viii. 32).—In Christianity two things are of preëminent importance—an upright character and a steadfast continuance in it. The one cannot and must not be without the other; for if we fail at the outset in uprightness of character, much more shall we fail in steadfastness. And if the latter is wanting, the beginning and the earlier progress will be in vain (Ezek. xxxiii. 12).—One day is like another; we may always fail and fall: therefore, to-day, to-morrow, and at all times there is need of watchfulness and caution (1 Cor. x. 12).—God is inconceivably long-suffering, and waits long before He punishes; and meanwhile He is doing good to sinners, and always alluring them to repentance (Rom. ii. 4).—O! how many men fail to attain that natural limit of life which God has appointed! They cut it short to themselves by wilful sin, and it is shortened to them again by the Divine wrath (Prov. x. 27).—Wilt thou charge unrighteousness upon God, that He lets good come to one and evil to another? Look, He is so righteous that He punishes none except him who is deserving of punishment (Job xxxiv. 11; Wis. xii. 15).—Unbelief is the source of all sin. From

unbelief sprang murmuring and all disobedience, inasmuch as by this they denied the presence, omnipotence, wisdom, and grace of God.

Berlenburger Bible:—Since Christ is to rule in us as Lord in His house, we must accept the condition of hearing His voice and giving heed to it at every moment.—The people demand indeed, Christ, but when He comes without sufficient adornment and decoration, they reject Him, and are hardened.—All evil which befalls us springs from our giving no ear to the voice of God, just as our hearkening to it is followed by nothing but good.—The ways of God are entirely unknown and strange to the flesh; the heart of man always wanders about in other things; and thus, also, the dispensations of God are entirely contrary and repugnant to man's self-will.—Tenderly as God loves a soul, He cannot treat with tenderness its corrupt disposition.—They are zealous for the Sabbath, and have no rest in their heart.—God commences His chastisement by depriving us of *rest*, in order that we may observe that we have lost something.—If we love others, we admonish them. Open your eyes and see!—Unbelief is a toilsome and an evil thing, which also allows no repose to others.—Now we still hear the call, "to-day;" but the gracious interval may soon close and end. Thus the boundary, with all its uncertainty, is to be kept before our eyes. But God creates this uncertainty, not in order to vex us, but in order to guard us against false security.—The present life is to be regarded merely as a day. Blessed is he who uses it for eternity!—God has appointed the period of life as the period of repentance; yet we may not say that the limit of grace reaches absolutely to the limit of nature.—Paul is obliged to give more space to warnings than to doctrines. Such admonitions are commonly disliked; one must, therefore, deal in them sparingly; yet they spring from an evangelical heart.—Whoever wilfully neglects salvation, who can help him?—In warning a person against the danger of being hardened, we do not deny his former possession of grace, but we remind him that he must not lose his previous grace.

Laurentius:—The ground of the admonition is twofold: 1, Christ's superiority to Moses; 2, the appeal of the Holy Spirit.—The greater the grace of God, so much the greater frequently is the wickedness of men.—Believers also need to be admonished.—By the false pretexts of sin man is deceived, and by the deceitfulness of sin he is hardened.—By frequent admonition, much evil can be guarded against.—Faith can be again lost.—Not the beginning, but the end, receives the crown.—Unbelief is the capital sin, and is specially punished by God; the examples of punishments inflicted on others should serve as a warning to us.

Rambach:—The heart is hard even by nature, but God endeavors to soften it. If we oppose ourselves to Him, the hardness becomes obduracy.—Unbelief is the single and proper cause of damnation.—Sin has regard to the disposition. With the ungodly she uses force and not cunning, saying, Thou must do that. With believers whom she is unable to rule, she employs cunning and deception.

Steinhofer:—It is the office of the Holy Spirit to testify and to warn against the sin of unbelief, and this office He constantly exercises in the preached word.—What takes place in the case of souls that come into the state of grace, and what is required in order that we may remain in this condition.

Hahn:—What God has already done in us, gives us a new incentive to fidelity.—Though we ourselves find nothing in ourselves, we are still as yet not justified; but we must appeal to another that he should pronounce our justification.—We have before us a goal; therefore we should seek to preserve one another; one should kindle another's zeal, not light the flame of his passion. Such are the obligations of Christian fellowship.

Rieger:—We meet, within the barriers of the race-course of faith, not only footsteps in which to follow, but also doubtful and dangerous deviations, and connected with these, warnings of the Holy Spirit.—Every one has his fixed barriers and ordained course of faith, from his first hearing of the voice of God even to the goal.—In regard to faith, and our participation in the heavenly calling, we must neither be timid and distrustful, nor again secure and heedless as if there were no danger.—The deceitfulness of sin need only to withdraw one *to-day* after another, from the attention of thy heart, in order to cheat thee unobserved of thy whole gracious season of many years.—In admonitions and appeals from the word of God, lies a drawing and a calling of God, which sin cannot so much destroy as our own purposes.

Von Gerlach:—As long as the Holy Spirit is still working on the heart, so long continues our respite of grace.

Heubner:—The continuous office of the Holy Spirit in the Church is, to lay Christ upon the heart, to urge us to faith, to rebuke unbelief.—Even in the Old Testament we perceive the voice of the Spirit.—The Spirit urges not irresistibly.—The guilt is man's, the merit is God's.—The foolishness of men is a perpetual provoking and tempting of God.—The "*to-day*" is 1. a word reminding us of the daily never-ceasing preaching of the Divine word; 2. a word that awakens to repentance; 3. a word of warning against delay; 4. a word of consolation, for where God still calls and still makes His voice heard, the period of grace has not as yet flown by.—Without rest, without repose, wanders round the disobedient son, who hears not the voice of his father.—The weary, wandering soul must strive after the rest of God. — Who trembles not at the words, "never to attain to the rest of God; forever to be banished from the realm of peace?"—If the ultimate issues of the wicked heart are so emphatically set before us in the case of others, this should make us all the more strict and rigorous towards ourselves.—To fall away from the living God, is to fall away from true life.—Had sin no deceitful form, she would not lead astray; let him who knows her, warn the inexperienced; let all be indefatigable in exhorting and in hearing. — The grace obtained through Christ remains only to the steadfast believer; it becomes punishment to him who does not hold on to faith.

STIER:—Nothing is demanded of us previously to, or upon any other ground than, our having heard the word of God which brings us grace and salvation.—The successive stages of apostasy are always the same.

AHLFELD:—To-day let the voice of God warn you against being hardened. We consider 1. the course by which obduracy proceeds onward to judgment; 2. the course by which grace breaks in pieces the hard heart.—Labor with earnestness against thine own hardening. The chief points of this labor are: 1. honest self-examination; 2. hearty, mutual, fraternal admonition; 3. diligence in looking back over the grace which we have received.

VON BOGATZKY:—We must not only guard against rude blasphemers, and abominate them, but also take heed to our own heart, and see how this wanders, swerves, and becomes alienated from God.—Whoever holds a sin to be small and insignificant, is already deceived by sin, falls already into error, and, corrupted by his delight in error, is finally utterly hardened.—The commencement of upright and genuine faith brings us already to a complete union with Christ, and is a true foundation, receives Christ as a whole, and rests entirely in Christ as upon its reliable foundation.—Holding fast, we are to hold out unto the end.—Our heart is so unbelieving, that if we ten times experience the help of God, and find ourselves strengthened in faith, still when there comes a fresh emergency, trial and exercise of our faith, unbelief again immediately bestirs herself.—Our God is alone the living God; thus He will give us also life, and power, and full supplies, and will be Himself our life, our light and salvation, and the strength of our life. Thus we need not with our hearts turn with lustful desires to the needy creatures who assuredly without Him can give no life, no true joy and satisfaction, and thus also we need not fear any creatures, not even the devil.—We have to pray for nothing but faith (although we have it already), in order that we may also maintain faith, and thus, believing unto the end, may save our souls.

HEDINGER:—God's wrath spares not the fathers, much less the children. Why? The latter should have made the conduct and fate of the former a mirror, in which they might behold and gaze upon their own.

[OWEN:—The formal reason of all our obedience, consists in its relation to the voice, or authority of God.—We see many taking a great deal of pains in the performance of such duties as, being not appointed of God, are neither accepted with Him, nor will ever turn unto any good account unto their own souls.—Consideration and choice are a stable and permanent foundation of obedience.—Many previous sins make way for the great sin of finally rejecting the voice or word of God.—Old Testament examples are New Testament instructions.—Especial seasons of grace for obedience, are in an especial manner to be observed and improved.—It is a dangerous condition for children to boast of the privileges of their fathers, and to imitate their sins.—Take heed, gray hairs are sprinkled upon you, though you perceive it not. Death is at the door. Beware, lest your next provocation be your last.—When repentance upon convictions of provocations lessens or delays, it is a sad symptom of an approaching day, wherein iniquity will be completed.—Whithersoever sin can enter, punishment can follow.—Though vengeance seems to have a lame foot, yet it will hunt sin, until it overtake the sinner.—A careless profession will issue in apostasy, open or secret, or in great distress, Matth. xiii. 5, 6.—This privative unbelief is two-fold: 1. in *refusing to believe*, when it is required; 2. in rejecting the faith after it hath been received.—We have but a most uncertain season for the due performance of certain duties. How long it will be called to-day, we know not.—Union with Christ is the principle and measure of all spiritual enjoyments and expectations.—Therefore are the graces and works of believers excellent, because they are the graces and works of them that are united unto Christ.—Constancy and steadfastness in believing, is the great touch-stone, trial and evidence of union with Christ, or a participation of Him.—God sometimes will make men who have been wickedly exemplary in sin, righteously exemplary in their punishment.—No unbeliever shall ever enter into the rest of God].

III.

The promise of entering into the rest of God not only still remains in force, but applies specially to us Christians.

CHAPTER IV. 1-10.

Let us therefore fear, lest [perchance], a promise being left *us* [there remaining a promise] of entering into his rest, any [one] of you should [may] seem to [have]
2 come short of it. For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them [For we

have had the glad announcement just as did also they]: but the word preached [the
word of their hearing] did not profit them, not being mixed[1] with faith in them
3 [not having united itself by faith with them] that heard *it*. For we which [who]
believe do enter[2] into rest [according] as he [hath] said, As I have sworn [swore,
ὤμοσα] in my wrath, if they shall [they shall not] enter into my rest: although the
4 [his] works were finished from the foundation of the world. For he spake [hath]
spoken] in a certain place [somewhere, πού] of the seventh *day* on this wise [thus],
5 And God did rest [on] the seventh day from all his works. And in this *place* again,
6 If they shall [They shall not] enter into my rest. Seeing therefore it remaineth that
some must [for some to] enter therein, and they to whom it was first preached [who
formerly received the glad promise] entered not in because of unbelief [disobedience];
7 Again he limiteth a certain day, saying in David, To-day, after so long a time; as it
is said, To-day [he again fixeth a certain day, To-day, saying, through David so long a
time afterward (as hath been said before),[3] To-day] if ye will [*om.* will] hear his voice,
8 harden not your hearts. For if Jesus [Joshua] had given them rest, then would he
9 not afterward have spoken [be speaking] of another day. There remaineth therefore
10 a rest [a Sabbath rest] for the people of God. For he that is [*om.* is] entered into
his rest, hath [also himself] ceased [rested] from his own [*om.* own works] [just] as
God *did* from his [own, ἰδίων].

[1] Ver. 2.—Instead of the Nom. Sing., *συγκεκραμένος* which is found in 5 minusc. 17, 31, 37, 41, 114, the Acc. Plur., in the form *συγκεκρασμένους*, is found in A. B. C. D.* M. 23, 25, and in the form *συγκεκεραμένους* (also with double μ), in D.*** E. I. K. 4, 6, 10. Moreover the Copt., Æth., Arm., and most of the versions have the Acc. But it scarcely yields any sense. The Nom. has the authority of the Peshito, Vulg., Ital., and of the Cod. Sin. in the form *συγκεκερασμένος*.

[2] Ver. 3.—Instead of *εἰσερχώμεθα οὖν* we are to read with Sin. A. C. *εἰσερχόμεθα γάρ*. The following *οἱ πιστεύσαντες* is also inconsistent with the hortatory subjunctive.

[3] Ver. 3.—Instead of *εἴρηται*, read with Sin. A. C. D.* E.,* 17, 23, 31, *προείρηται*.

[Ver. 1.—*φοβηθῶμεν οὖν*, Aor. Pass., in middle sense. *Let us fear, therefore,—μή ποτε, lest perchance, lest haply,—καταλειπ. ἐπαγ, there remaining a promise*, not *ἀπολειπ*, "there remaining as a logical consequence," but "there remaining being left, as a *historical fact*, the promise not having been exhausted with the ancients—as the author proceeds to develop from the Psalm.

Ver. 2.—*καὶ γάρ ἐσμεν εὐ.*, the emphasis rests on the verb, not, as in Eng. ver., on the pronoun. For we *have had* the glad tidings, *etc.* The rendering, "unto us was the Gospel preached," is unfortunate, marring, and even obscuring the thought.—*καθάπερ κἀκεῖνοι, just according as also they.*—ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς, *the word of their hearing*—the word which they heard.—*μὴ συγκεκ, not having mixed itself, i. e.*, united itself.

Ver. 3.—*καθὼς εἴρηκεν, according as he hath said,—εἰ ἐλεύσονται*, should be rendered, as ch. iii. 11, "*they shall not enter*," a familiar Hebraism—if they shall enter then my word will fall to the ground, or some such suppressed clause.—*καί τοι τῶν ἔργων γεν.*—gen. absolute, *and that you see his* [*viz.*, *God's*] *works being accomplished—although his works were accomplished*, and thus his rest established.

Ver. 6.—*οἱ πρότερον εὐαγγελισθ. they who formerly received the glad tidings, viz.*, the promise of the rest.—*ἀπείθειαν, disobedience*, not *unbelief* (ἀπιστίαν).

Ver. 7.—*πάλιν ὁρίζει*, dependent on *ἐπεί, since it remains, etc., he again fixes, appoints*, not as Eng. ver. beginning a new sentence—*λέγων μετὰ τὸν χρονον—saying so long a time after—καθὼς προείρηται, as has been said before, viz.*, in the former chapter.

Ver. 8.—*Ἰησοῦς, Joshua* (not Jesus),—*οὐκ ἂν—ἐλάλει, he would not be speaking*, not, "he would not have spoken."

Ver. 9.—*σαββατισμός*, not merely a *rest* (as Eng. ver.), but with reference to the rest of God on the seventh day, at the close of creation, a *Sabbath rest*, a *Sabbatism*.—K.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **Let us fear, therefore—come short of it.**—The chapter—not entirely clear in its exact line of thought—opens with a passage whose import has been matter of much controversy. Expositors, however, are now nearly unanimous in holding that the Gen. *καταλειπ. ἐπαγ.*, cannot, in the absence of the article, depend on *ὑστερηκέναι* (Cramer, Ernesti), and also that *καταλείπειν*, while sometimes, indeed, signifying *neglect, disregard* (Acts vi. 2; Baruch iv. 1), yet here, as shown partly by the absence of the article, partly by the passive form of the Participle, but chiefly by the usage of vv. 6, 9, cannot be so rendered, but only, *to be remaining*. And we can hardly fail to perceive that this expression points back, on the one hand indeed, to the definite promise, but on the other, still by the absence of the article, indicates a designed indefiniteness, or a very general mode of conceiving it. This view is confirmed by the fact that the author subsequently understands the expression, *κατάπαυσίς μου*. (ch. iii. 11), here *αὐτοῦ*,—not, in the sense of the Psalm, of the rest which God has promised and designs to give, but of the rest which belongs properly to God. This rest into which believers are destined to enter, is thus still to be distinguished from the rest which God has actually given to His people by the possession of the Promised Land (Deut. xii. 9). Since this idea of the expression in question is not the original sense of the passage in the Psalm, but only the author's own interpretation of it, he proceeds to give a proof of the substantial correctness of his explanation. This, therefore, is not, as yet, at this passage, to be presupposed with the readers of the Epistle. In fact, also, the author deduces from the fate of the Israelites in the desert, not that which many interpreters introduce into it, *viz.*, that the Divine promise, because it remains unfulfilled, is yet existing. For it might have been objected, that the promise was in fact subsequently fulfilled to the descendants of those who perished in the wilderness when they entered Canaan under Joshua. The inference from that is rather that we have need to fear; to this he exhorts us, for he has shown that the *reverse side* of the Divine promise, the no less positively uttered and oath-sanctioned *threat* of God, that His people, of that time, should not

enter into His rest, was fulfilled in all of them, and that in consequence of unbelief. *Hic nobis commendatur timor non qui fidei certitudinem excutiat, sed tantam incutiat solicitudinem ne securi torpeamus* (Calvin).

Against what, therefore, are we now to be on our guard? What are we to fear? and to what are we, in true fear, to direct our anxious care, in order that that which we fear may be averted and not come upon us? *We* are to beware of resembling the Israelites by our unbelief in the Word of God, which is proclaimed to us. We are to fear the wrath of God, which within the sphere of even the *chosen* people has still displayed its judicial terrors upon all unbelievers. And our common fear should direct itself to the point (φοβηθῶμεν οὖν) that, while there exists a promise of entering into His rest, no individual one among you may be found to have come too late (μήποτε δοκῇ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν ὑστερηκέναι). Δοκῇ is so conspicuous in its position, that it cannot possibly be regarded as superfluous, (Mich., Carpz., Abresch), and the gravity and earnestness of the connection, which presently calls out the most solemn exhortations, and startling pictures of the fate of apostates, demands a very cautious admission of the view which resolves it into the softening *videatur* (=*may seem*) of elegant discourse (Oec., Theoph., Thol., Lün.).* On the other hand, we can scarcely regard it as of *intensifying* import=lest there be even an *appearance* that this or that one has remained behind (Pareus, regarded approvingly by Del.). We must regard it as expressing the appearance of an *actual condition*, as it presents itself to the *opinion and estimate of others*, and must conceive the condition as that of that substantial lingering behind, which results in inevitable exclusion. It is doubtless grammatically possible to take δοκῇ as the leading term, expressing the individual's *personal opinion*, and ὑστερηκέναι as denoting *a too late arrival* in respect of *time*, the whole then= *may think he has arrived too late*—(Schöttg., Baumg., Schultz, Wahl, Bretschn., Steng., Paul., Ebrard). But with this accords neither the moral condition of the readers, nor the connection of the passage, which, attached by φοβηθῶμεν οὖν to the preceding chapter, cannot possibly be introducing a *consolatory* address to persons troubled by an extraordinary illusion regarding their salvation, or a *warning* against their indulgence of this illusion, (as if we had the comforting words μὴ οὖν φοβηθῶμεν, *let us not then fear*, instead of the words of *warning*, *let us therefore fear lest*). The passage rather opens with the admonition and summons, based on the preceding glance at the fate of ancient Israel, that they should resolutely and earnestly avoid the threatening danger that any member of the church —while God's invitation, full of gracious promises, is addressed to him—should by guilty delay, springing from unbelief in the word of invitation, make it necessary that he be regarded as having been left behind on his way to the promised goal. The rendering of Grotius, *ne cui vestrum libeat* (that it may not seem best to any one, may not be the pleasure of any one of you), is inconsistent with the Inf. *Perf.*, and with the construction, which would have required the Dat.

VER. 2. **For we have had the joyful message—in them that heard it.** Καθάπερ (*precisely according as*) found elsewhere in the New Testament only with Paul, denotes, in its classical use, relations of entire equality. Εὐαγγελίζεσθαι is also used, Luke vii. 22; xvi. 16, passively, as here, of those to whom glad tidings are announced. The Subst. εὐαγγέλιον is not found in our epistle, and with Luke only Acts xv. 7; xx. 24. The λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς, which at Sir. xli. 23, denotes what is received by tradition, and at 1 Thess. ii. 8, is applied to the New Testament preached word, is very significant for the Word of God made known by *proclamation* to the people of God of all times, Ex. xix. 5; Is. xxviii. 9; Jer. xlix. 14, and corresponds particularly to the Heb. שְׁמוּעָה Is. lii. 7; liii. 1 (Rom. x. 14–17)=*that which is announced, news, tidings*, connected sometimes with the Gen. of the subject matter, 2 Sam. iv. 4, sometines with that of the bearer of the tidings, Is. liii. 1. The Dat. τοῖς ἀκούσασιν is expressly employed to indicate that the πίστις indispensable to the right and efficient influence of the word was wanting to them that had heard the word, and that for this reason it had not united itself with those for whom it was otherwise adapted, and for whom it was destined of God. This Dat. would be with the very old and well attested reading of the Acc. Plur. of συγκεκ., totally unintelligible. For to put upon ἀκούειν the sense of *obey* is a purely desperate make-shift, and the rendering "because they did not associate themselves by faith with those who obeyed," *viz*: Joshua and Caleb (Œc., Phot., Hammond, Cram., *etc.*), is totally alien from the use made of this history in the previous chapter. Bleek, therefore, reads ἀκούσμασιν after Theodoret, with whom, however, ἀκουσθεῖσιν is probably to be read, as conjectured by his teacher Theodore of Mops., on the authority of the Vulg.="since they did not unite themselves by faith with the words which they had heard." The Nom., as indicated by the Peshito—the oldest version of the New Testament—is thus to be preferred with Erasm., Böhme, De W., Thol., Lun., Del. The opinion of Ebr., however, which I followed in my *comment.*, that the passage contains no repetition of the truth previously dwelt upon, *viz.*, that the word was proclaimed in vain to the Jews on account of their *subjective unbelief*, but presents rather the reverse side of the truth, *viz:* the *impotence* of the Old Testament word itself, and thus shows the word proclaimed by Moses as declaring the *promise*, indeed, along with the *conditions* of its fulfilment, yet possessing no power, like the word of the New Testament (v. 12) to penetrate

* [With a writer of a different description, Moll's objection to this interpretation might have more weight: in the case of our author it seems to be of very questionable validity. It should be borne in mind that the very characteristic and distinguishing feature of our epistle is the utmost possible cogency of reasoning, and stern and terrible force of appeal, couched in, (we might almost say), the utmost possible smoothness and flowing grace of diction. An earnestness of thought and sentiment that never for a moment relaxes itself, moves on *pari passu* with a majestic stateliness, and a classic grace of style, that never for a moment forgets its urbanity, and never allows its even repose to break forth into passionate vehemence of expression. In such a style the occurrence of an elegant and even softening term like δοκῇ in the sense here given to it, could scarcely be matter of surprise or objection.—K.].

into the marrow and core of the inner life, and by such admixture identify itself thoroughly with the hearer — this assumption, I say, anticipates the following discussion, introduces a meaning into the words outside of their obvious and natural import, and depends also on Ebrard's false interpretation of ver. 1. If we construct τῇ πίστει with the nom. συγκεκραμένος, *mixed with faith*, then it were better to regard τοῖς ἀκούσασιν as Dat. of reference=*in respect to*, as often in cases where the Gen. would be liable to misconception (Win., Lun.), than with De Wette, as *Dativus commodi*, or as the Dat. of the agent for ὑπό with Gen. (as by Luther until 1527)=" not being blended with faith by them (=ὑπὸ τῶν) that heard it." It accords better, however, with the actual relations of faith alike to the word and to the hearers to connect τοῖς ἀκούσασιν closely with συγκεκρ. and take τῇ πίστει as Dat. of *means* (Schlicht., Thol.,) *etc.*

VER. 3. **For we are entering into rest as they that have believed,** *etc.*—The γάρ *for* stands in logical connection, not with a part, but with the entire statements of the preceding verse. It is best explained by taking εἰσερχόμεθα, not as present for a somewhat general and indeterminate future"=" *we are to enter*," (Bl., De W., Thol.); or as marking that which we may with certainty anticipate (Lun.), and the Aor. Part. οἱ πιστεύσαντες (with the majority) of those who have *established the genuineness* of their faith; but rather by explaining the Part. of those simply *who have believed*, *who have exercised faith*, and of course have thus far attested it, Acts iv. 32; xi. 21; xix. 2; Rom. xiii. 11, and the verb εἰσερ. therefore, in its proper present sense of those who *are actually entering into rest*, (Del). We, the church of the believers, the author would say, are as such travelling on the way to the rest which God has established since the foundation of the world, but which the Israelites did not attain. Ebrard erroneously takes the ἔργα " works finished" of ver. 3, as contrasted with faith, and as denoting *human performances*, *the works of the law*, in contrast with which the true way of salvation, that of faith, was to be revealed. But the term can refer only to the works of *God* (ver. 4 and 10), which stand as accomplished since the foundation of the world, and since which, therefore, there is existing a *Rest of God*. Although (καίτοι) this is the case, still, according to the declaration of God, Ps. xcv. 11, the Israelites who were called thereto, did not enter into it. Luther, following the erroneous rendering of the Vulgate *et quidem* (*and indeed*), connected the clause commencing with καίτοι with the following εἴρηκεν, leaving the γάρ after εἴρηκεν wholly unregarded. Schlicht., Carpz., *etc.*, make the Gen. also depend on κατάπαυσιν=*the rest of works which were accomplished*, *etc.*, a construction which would require τῶν repeated after ἔργων (τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἀπό, *etc.*). And Calv., Bez., Limb., Cram., Böhm., Bisp., explain thus; " namely," (or perhaps *although*) into a rest which followed upon the completion of the works of creation: a thought that would certainly have been expressed in different phraseology.

VER. 4. **For he hath said in a certain place.—And in this place again.**—We are not to supply, as subject of εἴρηκεν, ἡ γραφή (Böhm., Bisp., *etc.*), notwithstanding that in the citation itself God is spoken of in the third person. For the same subject must be supplied to both citations, and in the latter (ver. 5) the μου shows that God must be regarded as the subject. Here also it again becomes evident that God is He who is conceived as the one who speaks in Scripture. [I doubt if Moll's reason for rejecting ἡ γραφή as subject of εἴρηκεν, drawn from the citation ver. 4, or the implied one for making *God* the subject, as drawn from the citation of ver. 5, is, either of them, decisive. They are both given as simple *citations*, and would both, therefore, naturally stand in precisely their present form, whether we were to conceive "The Scripture," or "God" speaking in the Scripture, as the subject of the verb. And the application of the passage to the author's purpose would, I conceive, be equally answered, whichever subject we assume. Still, with Moll, I prefer ὁ θεός as subject.—K.].—Since the passage, Gen. ii. 2, is so entirely familiar, πού cannot possibly imply any uncertainty on the part of the author regarding the *source* of the citation; and from this we may draw a certain inference regarding the πού in ch. ii. 6. The two passages of Scripture thus quoted in connection, bring out the idea that there is from the commencement of things a Rest of God, into which men could and were to enter, but into which the Israelites have not entered; yet that by this the entrance into the Rest of God cannot be sealed and made impossible for all times and all men, since the exclusion of the Israelites was but a manifestation of the wrath of God upon the unbelieving.

VER. 6. **Since, therefore, it remains open that some are to enter in,** *etc.*—The comparison of the two passages leads to the conclusion, not precisely, that the entrance is still *remaining and reserved* for *some persons*—which would have demanded καταλείπεται—but that such an entrance is *left free*, *left over*, *remains open* (ἀπολείπεται, ch. x. 26), ["not having been previously exhausted." ALF.], and that, on account of this state of the case, God in His grace and faithfulness, after the well-known falling away of those who were called in the time of Moses, again characteristically fixes (ὁρίζει) a day, 'to-day,' in which, after the lapse of so long a period, He, through David, repeats the summons of invitation, which had formerly been proclaimed by Moses. As the Sept. ascribes the Psalm in question to David, and here we have not ἐν τῷ Δαυίδ, but ἐν Δαυίδ (taking David *personally*), we are not here, although the Book of Psalms may, as a whole, be regarded as belonging to David (Acts iv. 25), to take the words as applying to the *book*. For ἐν Δαυίδ would properly, in referring to a passage of Holy Scripture, mean "in the passage of Scripture that treats of David," as ἐν Ἠλίᾳ, Rom. xi. 2.—Schlicht., Stengel, *etc.*, connect the first σήμερον with λέγων. Others, more recently Lün. and Del., regard it as a part of the quotation, which, commencing emphatically, for this reason, after an interposed clause, repeats the same word. The majority, with Calv., Bez., Grot., take it as in apposition with ἡμέραν.*

* [To see the difference between the two explanations, the reader must first correct the English version, which is here

Ver. 8. For if Joshua had brought them to their rest, *etc.*—The *μετὰ ταῦτα*, corresponding to *μετὰ τοσοῦτον χρόνον* of the preceding verse, belongs to *ἐλάλει* scil. *ὁ θεός*. But the Imperf. with *ἄν* is not to be rendered, "He would have spoken" (Luth., Bez.), which would have required *ἐλάλησεν ἄν*, but "he would be speaking." The fact that God, after the introduction of the people into the Promised Land, speaks of a day in which His voice summons to an entrance into His rest, proves not only that the Rest of God, which has existed since the creation, is not identical with the rest proclaimed to the people by Moses, and secured for them under Joshua, but that this entire proceeding with the Israelites is simply to be regarded as figurative, and as having its fulfilment through Christ in the New Testament economy. In the later books of Scripture, Ezra, Nehem., Chron., Joshua, instead of the earlier יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, is named יֵשׁוּעַ, whence the writing Ἰησοῦς of the Sept., of Joseph., and the Acts vii. 45.—*Καταπαύειν* here in its classical transitive sense *to cause to rest, to bring to rest*, as Ex. xxxiii. 14; Deut. iii. 20; v. 33; Ps. lxxxv. 8; Acts xiv. 18.

Ver. 9. There remaineth therefore a Sabbath rest, *etc.*—The particle *ἄρα* (rarely *commencing* a sentence in *prose*), now introduces the conclusion to which the preceding statements have led the way; not only is there a Rest of God existing from the close of the creation, and reaching on to eternity, and not only is a participation in this rest *appointed* to the people of God, but the entrance into it is actually secured to the people of God. This rest is a *σαββατισμός*=*a Sabbath festal celebration* (from *σαββατίζειν*, Ex. xvi. 30, as *ἑορτασμός* from *ἑορτάζειν*). The term (found also in Plut. *de superstitione*, 8) is all the more natural, inasmuch as already at ver. 4, reference is made to that rest of God after the creation of the world, which lay at the basis of the institution of the Sabbath, as the rest of humanity, and in that, apart from any Rabbinical explanations, even at 2 Macc. xv. 1, the Sabbath is called *ἡ τῆς καταπαύσεως ἡμέρα*. The *ὁ εἰσελθών, he who entered in*, is certainly not the people (Schultz), but either *Christ*, as indicated by the Aor., *κατέπαυσεν, rested* (Alting, Starck. Owen, Valck., Ebr., Alf.), or (with the majority of expositors, among them Bleek, Lün., Del.), inasmuch as nothing in the context points immediately and personally to Christ, *the person*, whoever he may be, *that has reached the goal*. It thus assigns the reason why the rest in question is called a *Sabbatism*. The Aor. is then explained as a reminiscence from the citation in ver. 4. [The question is a difficult one to settle. On the one hand, the historical *κατέπαυσεν, rested*, more naturally points back to some single historical event, as the entrance of Christ into His rest, and the emphatic *καὶ αὐτός, also he himself*, giving, as Alford remarks, dignity to the subject which we should scarcely expect if it refer to any individual man, would suggest the same idea, while it is certainly pertinent to introduce Christ as the great Leader and Institutor of the rest of the New Testament people of God, by finishing and resting from His own works. But, on the other hand, there does not seem, as supposed by Alford, any antithesis in this passage between Christ and Joshua; the specific object of the verse seems to be simply to explain why the writer has changed the term *κατάπαυσις* into *σαββατισμός*, and the *καὶ αὐτός*, therefore seems entirely natural as explaining why the rest of the people of God is like the rest of God Himself, a Sabbatism; and the reference also of the subsequent *ἐκείνη ἡ κατάπαυσις, that rest*, is entirely pertinent, in view of the author's declaration that a Sabbatic rest awaits the people of God, and equally so in whichever way we understand the present verse. And as a positive argument against Alford's interpretation, we may urge Moll's suggestion, that nothing in the context points directly to Christ. The passage seems simply thrown in to account for the substitution of the term *σαββατισμός* for *κατάπαυσις*; for this there is no *need* of any reference to Christ, and had the author intended it, it would seem almost certain that he would have made his intention more obvious. I incline to the opinion of the majority, which refers it to individual members of the Church. The Part. *εἰσελθών*, is then used like *ἀποθανών*, Rom. vi. 7, although for the *fin. verb* we should certainly here, as there, prefer the Perf. But the Aor. may be explained partly as by De Wette, as a reminiscence from ver. 4, partly, perhaps, from the preference of the Greeks for the *form* of the Aor., whenever they *could* use it, to the clumsier and less euphonious Perfect.—K.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. In the Holy Scripture we hear the *voice of God* and the *language of the Holy Spirit*, so that we are to gain by this, not an external knowledge of natural things and historical events, but a spiritual understanding of them, in order to a right estimate of their relation to the kingdom of God. Precisely for this reason we must acquaint ourselves rightly with the Holy Scriptures, that we may be able correctly to understand their language, to give heed to their intimations, to make use of their hints, and to make the fitting application of their statements and explanations. For the sacred Scripture not merely throws upon all things and relations the light

exceedingly unfortunate. First, vv. 6 and 7 must be closely united, not more than a comma being placed after *unbelief*. Then the comma must be struck out after *again*, ver. 7, and this word connected closely with *ὁρίζει he again limits or fixes*. Again the phrase "as it is said," must be corrected first by a right translation of the Perf. *has been said*, and then by substituting the proper critical reading, *προείρηται, has been said before* (referring to the previous citation, ch. iii. vv. 7–15); and finally the phrase "after so long a time" must be put in its proper construction with "saying" (*λέγων*). We then render *either thus*: "Since, then, it still remains that some, *etc.*—on account of disobedience, he again fixes a certain day (*viz.*) 'to-day,' saying in David so long a time after" (*i. e.*, so long a time after the original promise—the long interval between Moses and David) "to-day if ye hear His voice," *etc.*, *or thus*: he again fixes a certain day: "to-day"—saying in David so long a time afterward—"to-day if ye hear," *etc.* In the former case "to-day" is taken in apposition with *ἡμέραν*, "a certain day, *viz.*, to-day." and so Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Bleek, De Wette, Moll, Bib. Union. In the latter "to-day" emphatically and somewhat abruptly commences the quotation, and then, after an intervening clause, is emphatically repeated. So Lünemann, Delitzsch, and decidedly Alford. The order of the words *σήμερον ἐν Δαυεὶδ λέγων* I think is in favor of the latter view. With the former the author would, I think, have more naturally written *λέγων ἐν Δαυείδ*.—K.]

of revelation, but also in that light interprets itself, and thus becomes profitable for the things mentioned 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

2. The Rest which God promises and gives to His people, is no other than the rest which *God Himself has and enjoys*. The creation and destination of man to be the image of God, contains the ground of the fact, that man can find rest only in God, and the grace of God renders possible even to fallen man the fulfilment of his destination. But the condition of entering into the rest of God, is *faith;* and this condition is the same for the different degrees of man's participation in that rest which God, since the creation of the world, until the completion of the world's history, repeatedly proffers to man, and holds open for his entrance.

3. "At every stage of the revelation of His grace to sinners, God proffers to them His *whole* salvation. Under every veil which He has thrown over His truth in the years of childhood, it lay *entire*, and even at that time believers could receive every thing from God. But since God does not perfect individuals apart from the whole, the general unbelief of those to whom He had proffered His salvation (notwithstanding that some few believed) at every successive stage, held back perfection. But no rejection of Divine grace, on the part of men, can hinder or restrain its ever increasingly glorious unfolding; but rather, as the sun from the bosom of night, so from the unbelief of men does it shine forth all the more clearly to the honor and praise of God. Thus also, of necessity, their spurning of the true rest of God, which had been proffered to the Israelites, led to the fact that they, under Joshua in Canaan, only entered into an earthly rest, in every respect unsatisfactory, perpetually interrupted, by which their longing after the true rest was rather awakened than satisfied. And thus the entrance into the rest of God, still awaits the people of the Lord; the celebration of the eternal Sabbath, after the second creation, of which that of the earthly Sabbath is but the type." Von Gerlach.

4. The labor from which the believer is yet to rest cannot, on account of the constitution of the world, and on account of the nature of actual human life, be separated from the idea of the *pain and toil of our earthly pilgrimage;* yet it is by no means to be limited to this. We must rather extend our thought to the *labor of the Christian vocation*, since this is designated in the text as that which is peculiar to Him, standing in the relation of an image and copy to the creative activity of God. "The struggle against sin, the pursuit of holiness, the striving after perfection (τελειότης), constancy in sufferings, all vigorous endeavor in holding fast to faith and hope, even under the most adverse circumstances; all the toilsome activity of self-denying, self-sacrificing love; all the labors, connected not unfrequently with great disquiet and anxiety, for the spiritual welfare of the entire Church and of its individual members; all these are the 'works' (ἔργα) of believers, from which they are yet to rest in the heavenly city of God" (Riehm).

5. As an eternal and blessed *Sabbath celebration*, this rest cannot be a cessation of all activity. This would correspond neither to the idea involved in the rest of God, nor to the promise of a personal progressive life of the children of the resurrection in the kingdom of glory. Moreover, the perfect consciousness of blessedness in the certainty of personal perfection in no way excludes an *active attestation of this consciousness*. The same holds true of the participation of the blessed in the approval and pleasure with which God looks upon the world of perfection as brought into a state of perfect conformity to His will. At all events, there is such an activity of the perfected in eternity as that which Thom. Aquinas designates as *videre, amare et laudare*, and August. (*de Civit. Dei*, 20, 30) thus describes: "*Ipse (Deus) finis erit desideriorum nostrorum qui sine fine videbitur, sine fastidio amabitur, sine defatigatione laudabitur.*" But is God to be the *sole* object of this activity? and is this activity itself to be regarded as susceptible of no development and advancement for the reason that it is an activity of those who are perfected? This would by no means essentially follow from Augustine's answer to the question, What the blessed will do in their eternal life: *In secula seculorum laudabunt te* (in Ps. 83). For praise, if it is not to be a mere empty sound, must consist in *real acts* of praise, with a definite meaning and substance. But this concrete substance, if it is not to degenerate into tautology and *battology*, must be susceptible of a development, and appear as the *product of an activity* of definite persons, whose inward feelings, experiences and thoughts it expresses. And in the case of these persons, again, we can conceive of the removal neither of that creaturely element by which they stand distinguished from God, nor of that *special human quality* that distinguishes them from angels; nor any more of that *individuality* which produces those special characteristics in the actual personal life of the perfected which involve alike the continuity of consciousness, the identity of the person that had died with the person that has risen; the possibility of reunion, and the possibility of retribution. On this double foundation of the permanent *creatureliness*, and of the individual personality of the glorified and perfected, we may base a well-founded conviction that there is in the life of the blessed an infinitude of relations and points of contact, which, in ceaseless and reciprocal influence, enlarge and enrich their common bliss and perfection. For we may with just as little propriety assume, on the part of the glorified, *an activity without result*, as a round of empty and unsubstantial adoration, or a mere idle and fruitless contemplation of God. Also, Rothe, in his *Ethics* (II. § 474) has admirably shown how we may conceive of *work* without the attendant idea of *labor, i. e.*, work accompanied by strenuous exertion; and Tholuck, in some weighty and suggestive intimations, has shown the mixture of truth and falsehood in the declaration of Lessing: "If the eternal Father held Truth in His right hand, and the search for it in His left, and I were required to choose, I would clasp His knee and say: Father, the left!" Inasmuch, however, as we have on this point no positive statements of Scripture, and are liable to transfer our human conceptions to the scenes and relations of the future world, it will be well to heed the warning of Stier (1, 85): "If thus deeply

looking into eternity, we are blinded by the overpowering splendor, and turn back again to the thought that such Sabbath rest is surely not to be conceived as devoid of working and activity, we are undoubtedly right to this extent, that the rest of God is indeed at the same time an eternal life of *infinite power*. But we must still be on our guard against allowing our weakness to mingle the earthly with the heavenly, and even in the attained city of God itself, to open a long-extended *chaussee-prospect* of 'infinite perfection;' rather will we strive with all the power of the spirit for a presentiment of that true rest, of that *perfected satisfaction and completeness* which has inherited all in God, and for which nothing more remains to be attained in eternity." This is all the more advisable as the feeling of *a real satisfaction in our true rest in God* must exist in the *most diverse stages of creaturely development*. Only we must not, with the earlier ecclesiastical teachers (*e. g.*, JOHN GERHARD, *Loci Theol.*, T. XX., p. 408), allow ourselves to infer from this that that deficiency in extent of the saints' knowledge of God, which, along with its *perfection in quality*, the very finiteness of their nature imposes upon the blessed, will, by the final judgment, be fixed and bound down to a definite limit, which will forever preclude all further development. For the unbounded and unrestricted activity of a creature within the limits that belong to and determine its peculiar organization—an activity that can never be conceived as without result—is something entirely different from a striving and aspiring beyond these limits. This, DANTE himself, in the words cited by THOLUCK (*Paradiso*, 8, 78 ff.), has not sufficiently regarded:

"For if we yielded to our higher wish,
Then should we come in conflict with that will
Which destined us to this our lower sphere."

6. It is a confused and perplexing use of language that speaks of *gradations of blessedness*. The idea of blessedness excludes distinctions of degree and relations of quantity. But doubtless there are *degrees of participation in the rest of God*. For, first, there is the *peace*, which the believer, as being justified, on the ground of his reconciliation with God through Jesus Christ possesses and tastes (Rom. v. 1), and which includes a devotion—constant and unvexed by the vicissitudes of life—to the will of God in His dispensations, and a confident hope of future blessedness and glory. Then, from this, we are to distinguish the *rest* of those who, as having fallen asleep in Christ, freed from the toils and sorrows of this earthly life (Rev. xiv. 13; xxi. 4), are with Christ (Phil. i. 23); and from this again we distinguish that *Sabbatic rest* which commences only at the second coming of Christ, and the accompanying renovation of the world, and which is realized only when the *whole* people of God have entered into eternal rest in and with God, and in which all the ransomed are at home forevermore (1 Thess. iv. 17). Within each of these three grades, however, is preserved inviolate not merely the specific quality of humanity as such, in contradistinction from the *angelic* nature and relation, but also the concrete individuality, previously referred to, of each person. This has been sometimes erroneously conceived as forming an intrinsic distinction in the degree of blessedness itself. The opinion of Swedenborg, that men may once have been angels, has no where the slightest support.

7. From the nature of the rest of God it follows that for the people of God, so long as they are still on their pilgrimage to the final goal, it must of necessity be *in the future;* for he who has entered into this, rests from his works in like manner as God did from His. In behalf of the view that a day which is entirely Sabbath will close the world's work, Del. adduces from Sanhedrin 97 *a*, the following passage: "As the seventh year furnishes a festal time of a year's duration for a period of seven years, so the world enjoys, for a period of seven thousand years, a festal season of a thousand years;" but remarks, then, that, as shown by Rev. xx. 7 ff., this final temporal millennium is not as yet the final Sabbath, although it has become customary in the Church to regard this temporal season of triumph and rest to the Church as ἡ ἑβδόμη (*the seventh day*), and the blessed eternity as ἡ ὀγδόη (*the eighth*); that this *octave* of the blissful eternity is nothing else than the eternal duration of the final Sabbath, which realizes itself only at the point where the history of time is merged into a blissful eternity. Similarly it is said in a Rabb. treatise on Ps. xcii. 1 (*Elijahu Rabba*, c. 2): "We mean the Sabbath which puts a stop to the sin reigning in the world—the seventh day of the world, upon which, as *post-Sabbatic*, follows the future world, in which forever and ever there is no more death, no more sin, and no more punishment of sin; but pure delight in the wisdom and knowledge of God."

8. Into this future Sabbath rest, however, they alone enter who *believe in the word of invitation* which has reached them, and *livingly unite themselves* with this, by faith. "Faith is, as it were, the dynamical medium by which objective truth assimilates itself to the believing man" (THOL.). "As food it must nourish, must go into the blood and unite itself with the body. If the word is to benefit, it must, like the nutritive element of food, be transformed by faith, into the spirit, sense and will of man, that the whole man may become as the word is, and requires, *i. e.*, holy, upright, chaste and pious" (HEDINGER, *Ed. of the N. Test., with explanatory remarks*, 1704).—"There are two sorts of words in the Scripture; the one affects me not, concerns me not; the other concerns me; and upon that which appertains to me I can boldly venture, and plant myself upon it, as on a solid rock.—Of this none may be in doubt, that to him also the Gospel is preached. Thus, then, I believe the word, *i. e.*, that it concerns me also—that I also have a share in the Gospel, and in the New Testament, and I venture my all upon the word, even though it were to cost a hundred thousand lives" (LUTHER's *Sermons on the First Book of Moses*, Walch, Part 3, p. 9).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The salutary fear of believers: 1, to what it refers; 2, whence it comes; 3, what it produces. In the souls of believers, fear and hope dwell in

inseparable connection; for, 1, they trust implicitly to the word of God, as well in His threatenings as in His promises; 2, they have perpetually before their eyes the blissful goal of their calling, and the examples of those who have fallen on the way; 3, they have a living consciousness of their own frailty, and of the Divine faithfulness.—Wherein consists the blessing of true and living faith? 1, It brings us into union with the *word* of God; 2, it protects us from the *wrath* of God; 3, it leads us into the *rest* of God.—At what does the preaching of the wrath of God aim? It aims, 1, to awaken the secure; 2, to warn the light-minded; 3, to urge on the sluggish.—The entrance into the rest of God may be neglected, inasmuch as, 1, God earnestly invites, indeed, to this entrance, but He compels no man to walk upon the right path; 2, the entrance stands for a long time open, but the period of grace comes finally to an end; 3, the entrance is sure to the people of God, but unbelief separates again many from the people of God.—What is the best consolation amidst the troubles of our earthly pilgrimage? 1, The encouragement of the word of God; 2, the fellowship of the people of God; 3, the prospect of the rest of God.—The fault lies not in God if any one attains not an entrance into the rest of God; inasmuch as, 1, God has established such a rest since the completion of the creation of the world; 2, God has, by the word of the Gospel, given to us all a sure promise and invitation; 3, God has prepared for us, in Jesus, the reliable leader for our entrance into this rest.—To what are we laid under obligation by God's proffers of His grace? 1, to the heeding of a season of grace; 2, to a use of the means of grace.—The faith which we profess, we have also to live: 1, what binds us to this duty? 2, what hinders us in it? 3, what aids us to victory?—How do we stand with respect to the rest of the seventh day? 1. Do we respect it as a holy ordinance? 2. Do we understand it in its salutary import? 3. Do we use it according to the Divine will and purpose?—How we must surely overcome the disquiet and danger of the world; 1, by confidence in the *promises;* 2, by obedience to the *ordinances;* 3, by submission to the *leadings* of God.—The right union of labor, rest, and festal gladness in the life of the Christian.

LUTHER (*Pref. to John Spangenberg's coll. of Sermons*, Walch XIV. 376):—In truth thou canst not read the Scripture too much: and what thou readest, thou canst not read too well; and what thou readest well, thou canst not too well understand; and what thou understandest well, thou canst not too well teach; and what thou teachest well, thou canst not too well live (*Domestic Sermons*, Walch XIII. 1336).—The preaching of faith is such a preaching as demands ever to be exercised and put in practice.—That I may come to the point of rising above every thing, of contemning sin and death, and of gladly venturing myself in all confidence upon the promise of God, I must have the Spirit and power of God, as also perpetual exercise and experience.

STARKE:—Away slavish fear! but filial fear must be present, that we walk therein, and so work out our salvation (Phil. ii. 12).—Not only must none remain behind for himself, but each one must also see to it, so far as the grace of God shall render it possible for him, that if others remain behind, he, by hearty exhortation, and his own good example, incite them to the course, and thus take them along with him.—Pilgrim, it is high time, if thou wouldst yet enter into the rest of God. Therefore hasten, and see to it, that thou do not come short of this blessedness.—Were there on the part of God an unconditional decree of human salvation, and were men, by virtue of this decree, unable to fall from the state of grace, and incur the loss of salvation, the holy men of God would not have been so zealous to warn believers against backsliding, and to exhort them to perseverance (2 Pet. iii. 17).—What avails it to listen to so many hundred sermons when we believe not, and receive no benefit? Mark! the word of God which thou hearest must flow into thine inmost soul, and must there give thee the full sap and nourishment of life, if it is to avail to thee for salvation (1 Thes. ii. 13).—The promises of God avail nothing to unbelievers. These must die without consolation, and perish eternally (Isaiah xl. 1).—The Gospel is, indeed, the power of God unto salvation, but it compels none to believe; but man retains his free-will to give place or not to the grace which knocks at the door of his heart.—Thou thinkest that it is very easy to come into heaven; but believe me, nothing common or unclean can enter thither. Unless thou art cleansed by faith, and art become a new creature, thou wilt not enter therein.—The repose of believers consists in this, 1, that we find all the works of God good, and are satisfied with these in the kingdom of nature and of grace; 2, that to that which God has devoted to us for our salvation, we desire to add nothing of our own, neither works of sin, nor even works of the law.—O how often are the first last, and the last first! Lord, Thy judgments are incomprehensible, and unsearchable Thy ways.—How highly should we respect the Psalms of David, since the Spirit of God has spoken by him!—To-day, since we hear the voice of Christ, let us obediently follow it; else we deserve that He withdraw from us His grace (John xii. 35).—God would at all times, have all men enter into His rest.—Nothing of all which the holy men of God have written is in vain; what we do not understand, testifies of our weakness and imperfection.—Beloved, let us not be impatient over the turmoil of sin, the assaults of the devil, the pains of our vocation, and our other burdens. For such is the character of our present life. In heaven we shall have peace from all these (Ps. xc. 10; Rev. xiv. 13).—O how deep is our concern, not only in the eternal rest itself, but also in that constant faith and obedience, without which that rest can never be attained.

BERLENBURGER BIBLE:—Promise is God's passport, which He gives us for our journey. He who throws away the promise, robs himself of aid.—We would fain be saved without employing the means.—The seed of all errors lies by nature in every one.—Because thou doest nothing, thou doest abundance of evil, and failest to accomplish thy duty.—The word in itself depends, indeed, in its power not upon my accept-

ance, since it is still powerful, but outside of me it avails me nothing.—All the works of God tend toward rest. But the time which is previously to elapse must not appear too long to us; but we must be assured that as God has brought us upon this way, He will also aid us to the end.—The work of creation is an image and foreshadowing of all the ways of God, clear to the end. The long extended time shows the long-suffering of God, and is given by God that we may recognize His goodness; but men readily abuse it to the indulgence of their sloth.—If God works in thee, thou art in rest; but if thou workest thyself, and in selfishness, thou hast nothing but disquietude.

Laurentius:—The life of believers is nothing but a journey into eternal rest.—We may *hear* much of eternal life, and still be excluded from it.—The rest of believers in this life is imperfect.—To the times which are noted in the sacred Scripture we must give special heed.

Rambach:—Each person of the sacred Trinity has, as it were, his special Sabbath and day of rest. The Father rested on the seventh day from the work of creation. The Son rested in the sepulchre from the work of redemption. The Holy Spirit will rest at last from the work of sanctification, *viz.*, then, when He shall have no more sin to do away.

Steinhofer:—Glory is reserved for us until our entrance into His eternal kingdom. It beams upon us from His throne, and will become manifest to us in His coming. In the meantime if we yield ourselves to His guidance, and hasten to the goal, He will infallibly bring us thither. We look merely to His heart and His hand; we remain tranquil; we let our Leader care for us, and willingly follow Him, upon that way in which He has not only preceded us and opened the path, but on which He is now also leading us, from step to step, by His power and grace, and will continue to lead us, until, at the last step, attaining complete deliverance and salvation, we also pass into the same glory, where we shall behold the brightness of God in the face of His Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, and be invested with this glory.

Rieger:—Every one should stand in fear and just distrust of his own heart, in order that to him the visible and eternal may not speedily sink into insignificance, the way that leads to it become disagreeable, his striving after the treasure be enfeebled, and he be tempted to turn back into Egypt. That must be and become true in my heart, which is true, and as it is true in the Word of God.—The promise on the part of God is so sincere, the faith which trusts to it is something so tenacious, that we may with these venture boldly forth for an entrance into rest.—Who is there whom God cannot, by a thousand means, make to feel that he has been driven from the place of rest?—Who is there who has yielded to the heavenly calling, that does not find himself, after his abandonment of the world, in a wilderness of temptation? In whom arises not the sigh: Lord Jesus may I soon inquire for my rest?—No man's progress is stopped by a previously formed decree of God; but it was the unbelief that showed itself on the way, that woke the wrath of God, and led Him to swear that they should not enter into His rest.—The purpose of God extends far. All ages, all nations that are successively born, are comprehended in it. Thus it bears with patience many a generation, and lo, that which was not accomplished in the fathers is to be attained in the children. God has prepared nothing in vain. It is His will that His house be full. No period of the world but contributes to the assemblage of His elect.

Von Bogatzky:—Labor, works and suffering belong to the divine arrangement, or to the way upon which we enter into rest. But it is faith alone, which lays hold of Christ, and in Him already here, and thus also yonder, finds eternal rest. Although eternal rest and blessedness are a gift of grace, they still demand all industry and diligence, power and strength, in order to our attaining them, because there are many enemies that would circumvent us of this rest, and hinder our entrance into it.—We evince our industry in entering into His rest, 1, if we studiously hear His voice, and are obedient to Him; 2, if we accompany the word with prayer; 3, if we actively prove our faith by love; 4, if we rightly employ the present time of grace, nay, the present day, the present hour; 5, if in all struggle, strife, conflict and suffering, we are always watchful and on our guard against our enemies, crucify the wicked flesh, as our most immediate enemy, and when heavier sufferings and assaults press in, do not yield to despair.

Stier:—As the *promise* stands remaining to us, so also stands good for us, in the strictest sense, the *warning* against wrath.—The *to-day* which is appointed to faith as an accepted time and day of salvation, after all the ways of Israel, which ended at last in the blinding and hardening of the majority of the people, at last clearly manifests itself as the *gracious season of the New Covenant*, in which the voice of God may be heard as never before.—The word of the Sabbatic rest! an inexhaustible consolation, with which ah! how many weary pilgrims, fainting combatants, sluggish laborers, have again and again armed themselves anew with strength and courage! A word of the Spirit which breathes upon the inner man, and refreshes with the powers of the world to come! A brightly glittering star of hope, guiding out of all darkness, back upon the right path!—By how much greater and more glorious the work of the redemption and restoration of fallen man, in whose fall the world is destroyed, than the work of the first creation, by so much more glorious is the second Sabbath of God in Christ, than the first Sabbath of Paradise.

Von Gerlach:—In the oath that *unbelievers* shall not enter in is involved for believers the promise that they *by faith shall enter in.*

Hedinger:—Hearing must be accompanied by faith; faith must be accompanied by perseverance.

Heubner:—The unconverted will doubtless wish, immediately after death, even then speedily to procure for themselves an entrance into bliss, but too late; late-comers are not waited for.—The threat as well as the promise is conditional. All earthly rest is imperfect; the true rest comes afterward.—For him who seeks his rest here, the

future world will bring unrest.—The rest of God promised to the Christian consists—1, in perfect freedom from all that disturbs, oppresses, obstructs, weakens, and pains the Christian here below: *a.* from outward disquiet of the world, of the body, and of evil men: *b.* from internal disquiet on account of his corruption and weakness; 2, in the blissful and undisturbed enjoyment of the grace and love of God; his soul then rests in God, after whom it was pining; he is then united with God through Christ in vision, enjoyment and feeling; 3, in the possession and blessed enjoyment of the good which his struggles have achieved, and in the perfectly free, never wearying, never exhausting prosecution of the new work that is assigned to us.—The Rest of God, the heavenly Sabbath, is to us a pattern and a goal; reminding us that, in the week of our present life, we accomplish our daily work, in order hereafter to attain to the heavenly Sabbath.

Fricke:—Every Sabbath is a beckoning to the Rest of God, and an attestation of it.

[Owen:—The failing of men through their unbelief doth no way cause the promises of God to fail or cease.—Men by their unbelief may disappoint themselves of their expectation, but cannot bereave God of His faithfulness.—The promise made unto Abraham did contain the substance of the Gospel.—The Gospel is no new doctrine, no new law; it was preached unto the people of old.—The Gospel is that which was from the beginning (1 John i. 1). It is the first great original transaction of God with sinners from the foundation of the world.—God hath not appointed to save men whether they will or no; nor is the word of promise a means suited unto any such end or purpose.—The great mystery of useful and profitable believing consists in the mixing or incorporating of truth and faith in the souls or minds of believers.—It is the proper description of an unbeliever, that "he doth not receive the things of the Spirit of God," 1 Cor. ii. 14.—Faith makes the soul in love with spiritual things: love engages all their affections into their proper exercise about them, and fills the mind continually with thoughtfulness about them, and desires after them; and this mightily helps on the spiritual mixture of faith and the word.—The people of God as such have work to do, and labor incumbent on them.—Rest and labor are correlates; the one supposeth the other. Many important truths lie deep and secret in the Scripture, and stand in need of a very diligent search and hard digging in their investigation and for their finding out.—There is no true rest for the souls of men, but only in Jesus Christ by the Gospel].

IV.

The peculiar and extraordinary nature of the word of God should deter us from resisting it.

Chapter IV. 11–13.

11 Let us labor [strive zealously, σπουδάσωμεν] therefore, to enter into that rest, lest
any man [any one] fall after the same example of unbelief [disobedience, ἀπειθείας].
12 For the word of God *is* quick [living], and powerful [effective, energetic, ἐνεργής],
and sharper than any two-edged sword [and], piercing [through] even to the dividing
asunder of soul[1] and spirit, and of the joints [of both joints] and marrow, and *is* a
discerner of [sits in judgment on, κριτικός] the thoughts [reflections] and intents
13 [thoughts] of the heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his
sight: but all things *are* naked and opened [laid bare] unto the eyes of him with
whom we have to do.

[1] Ver. 12.—The τε after ψυχῆς, is to be expunged according to Sin. A. B. C. H. L., 3, 73.

[Ver. 11.—Σπουδάσωμεν, *let us strive zealously*, 2 Pet. i. 10, "give diligence." Here Alf., *earnestly strive;* Bib. Un., *endeavor*, perhaps not quite strong enough. De Wette, *streben;* Moll, *ernstlich trachten.*—ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ—πεσεῖν. Eng. ver., *fall after;* Vulg., Luth., Del., Alf., Bib. Un., *etc.*, *fall into;* Moll, *fall in the like, etc.;* De Wette, *fall, as a like example.* All but the second (Vulg. *etc.*) take πεσεῖν, absolutely of *perishing*, against which Alf.. after Lün., urges its unemphatic position, but to which we may reply, that this springs from a desire to give a special emphasis to ἀπειθείας. Grammatically, πεσεῖν ἐν, for πεσεῖν εἰς, *fall into*, is doubtless admissible: but "fall in," or "into an example," is harsh, and "to fall into the same example," harsher still. I prefer taking with Eng. ver. and Moll, πεσεῖν, absolutely, of *perishing*, and I believe the expression to be a pregnant one, for "experience a like fall with that of those after whose disobedience you thus pattern;" the "pattern" not looking forward to the effect of their fall on others—which seems not at all in the author's sphere of thought—but *backward* to the effect of the fall of their fathers upon them.—τῆς ἀπειθείας, *disobedience*, not unbelief, ἀπιστίας.

Ver. 12.—Ζῶν γάρ, *for living*, placed emphatically at the beginning.—ἐνεργής, *working*, *operative*, *effective.*—τομώτερος ὑπέρ, *more cutting beyond*, a double comparative.—διικνούμενος, *coming through*, *piercing through.*—ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν, *both joints and marrow;* with the omission of the τε after ψυχῆς, these words become naturally an explanatory apposition to ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος.—κριτικὸς.: Eng. ver., Bib. Un., *discerner;* Alf., *judger*, or *discerner;* De Wette, *Richter;* Lün., *zu beurtheilen oder zu richten befähigt;* Moll, *richterlich.*—ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν, not, *thoughts and intents*, but *reflections*, or *sentiments*, *emotions*, *affections*, and *ideas*, *thoughts*, the former looking more to the moral and emotional, the latter to the intellectual nature.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 11. **Let us therefore strive earnestly to enter—example of disobedience.**—The fact stated in ver. 1, and subsequently unfolded, that there not only is a true rest for the people of God, consisting in a participation of the rest of God Himself, but that we Christians are invited to it by a word of promise, and have in Jesus our true Leader, leads now, according to our understanding of ver. 1, either to the resumption of the exhortation which it contains, or to a new exhortation to earnest and zealous striving for an entrance into that rest (*ἐκείνη, that*, marking the specific rest just described). Whoever intermits this striving will fall on the way, and will furnish precisely such an example of disobedience, alike in his conduct and his destiny, as did the nation of Israel, in their march through the desert. Instead of *παράδειγμα*, in familiar use with the earlier Attic writers, but wanting in the N. Test., we have here, as at 2 Pet. ii. 6, *ὑπόδειγμα*. Both words denote, sometimes *copy*, sometimes *pattern*. The *ἐν* is not=*per* (Wolf, Strig., *etc.*), or *propter* (Carpz.), but denotes *state* or *condition*, the *being in* (Bl., De W., Bisp., Del.). With this coincides substantially the view of Thol. that it corresponds with the *Dat. modi*, indicating the *way* and *manner* in which the fact as a whole presents itself (BERNHARDY, *Synt.* 100), *i. e.*, fall, and in his fall present the same example of disobedience as the Fathers. Πέσῃ is thus taken absolutely, a construction which, since Chrysostom has been given to it by most interpreters, though with an unwarranted reference to the use of the word, ch. iii. 17, they restrict it to mere *perishing* (exclusive of the idea of *sinning*). Lünemann (followed by Alford) maintains that the position of *πέσῃ* forbids our taking it here thus absolutely. But his view is untenable, and all the more so as his own explanation of the idea accords substantially with that given by us. He is right, however, in remarking that the translation of Luther, after the Vulg.: "that no one fall *into* the same example of unbelief," is not, as by and since Bleek, to be rejected on *grammatical* grounds. For *πίπτειν ἐν* is as good Greek as *πίπτειν εἰς*, only that it connects with the idea of *falling into*, that of subsequently *remaining in*. Del. adds still further examples from the Hellenistic, Ps. xxxv. 8; cxli. 10; Ezech. xxvii. 27.

VER. 12. **For the word of God is living—two-edged sword.** — Many distinguished Christian fathers, and, among recent expositors, Biesenthal even yet, regard the *λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ* here as the hypostatical or personal word of God; but as our Epistle nowhere else speaks of the personal Logos,—although it must certainly be supposed to have aided in preparing the way for that designation,—it is generally understood of the word of God as spoken and as recorded in the Scriptures. Under this view some (Schlicht., Mich., Abresch, Böhm., *etc.*) restrict it to the threatening and heart-piercing word of the O. Test., while others (Camero, Grot., Ebr., *etc.*) apply it to the Gospel of the N. T. Ebrard so regards it, even with reference to the fact that the Old Testament word remained *exterior*, and, as it were, a thing foreign to man. There is no ground, however, for such limitations; nor is there, on the other hand, any more ground for that wide and vague *generalizing* of the term which, with Bez., Schultz, Bisp., *etc.*, would include in it the whole range of the Divine threatenings and promises, and strip the passage entirely of its local coloring. It is clear from the context that the passage is designed to justify and enforce the preceding warning (ver. 1), terminating emphatically and designedly with its suggestive *ἀπειθείας*. To do this, the writer brings out the characteristic nature of the *word of God*. That which God says (Lün.) is, as a product of the Divine activity, infinitely different from every human word. But it appears here in reference to no specific subject-matter whatever, but in reference merely to this single and peculiar feature, that it *has proceeded from God*, and has the form of the Logos. This is indicated by the properties which are immediately ascribed to it. As a word of God, it is *living* (*ζῶν*), Acts vii. 38; 1 Pet. i. 23; having life in itself, while again the like appellation is given to God, from whom it comes, ch. iii. 12; x. 31. Ebrard interpolates into the thought a *contrast with the dead law;* while Schlichting and Abresch unwarrantably *restrict* its import to *imperishable duration*, and Carpz., equally unwarrantably, to its *capacity to nourish the life of the soul.* But the inner life of the word reveals itself in *actual operation.* Hence it is called *ἐνεργής, proving itself operative and efficient;* and since it lay within the scope of the author to unfold this feature of the word's peculiar character, it is called, "sharper than any two-edged sword." Such a sword, which, as *δίστομος*, or *double-mouthed*, 'devours' on both sides, issues, according to Rev. xix. 15, from the mouth of the Logos. Ὑπέρ stands after a comparative, Luke xvi. 8; Judges xi. 25, as *παρά*, ch. i. 4. In similar terms, Philo repeatedly speaks of the Logos.*

* [The following passages from Philo (cited by Lün.), are among the striking evidences that our author, while totally free from the mystical and allegorizing fancies of Philo, could yet have hardly been unacquainted or unfamiliar with his writings: *Qui rerum divinarum hæres*, p. 499. Εἶτ' ἐπιλέγει· Διεῖλεν αὐτὰ μέσα (Gen. xv. 10) τὸ τίς οὐ προσθεὶς, ἵνα τὸν ἀδίδακτον ἐννοῇς θεὸν τέμνοντα τάς τε τῶν σωμάτων καὶ πραγμάτων ἑξῆς ἁπάσας ἡρμόσθαι καὶ ἡνῆσθαι δοκούσας φύσεις τῷ τομεῖ τῶν συμπάντων αὐτοῦ λόγῳ· ὃς, εἰς τὴν ὀξυτάτην ἀκονηθεὶς ἀκμὴν, διαιρῶν οὐδέποτε λήγει τὰ αἰσθητὰ πάντα· ἐπειδὰν δὲ μέχρι τῶν ἀτόμων καὶ λεγομένων ἀμερῶν διέλθῃ, πάλιν ἀπὸ τούτων τὰ λόγῳ θεωρητὰ εἰς ἀμυθήτους καὶ ἀπεριγράφους μοίρας ἄρχεται διαιρεῖν οὗτος ὁ τομεύς . . . Ἕκαστον οὖν τῶν τριῶν διεῖλε μέσον, τὴν μὲν ψυχὴν εἰς λογικὸν καὶ ἄλογον, τὸν δὲ λόγον εἰς ἀληθές τε καὶ ψεῦδος, τὴν δὲ αἴσθησιν εἰς καταληπτικὴν φαντασίαν καὶ ἀκατάληπτον. Again *de Cherubim*, p. 112 f. Philo finds in the φλογίνη ῥομφαία, *flaming sword*, Gen. iii. 24, a symbol of the Logos, and then remarks in reference to Abraham: οὐχ ὁρᾷς ὅτι καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ὁ σοφὸς, ἡνίκα ἤρξατο κατὰ θεὸν μετρεῖν πάντα καὶ μηδὲν ἀπολείπειν τῷ γεννητῷ, λαμβάνει τῆς φλογίνης ῥομφαίας μίμημα, πῦρ καὶ μάχαιραν (Gen. xxii. 6), διελεῖν καὶ καταφλέξαι τὸ θνητὸν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ γλιχόμενος, ἵνα γυμνῇ τῇ διανοίᾳ μετάρσιος πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀναπτῇ. In the first passage, Philo speaks of "God dividing (cutting) all the natures of bodies and of things in succession, which seem to have been fitted and united together, *with His word, which is the divider* (cutter) *of all things*, which being whetted to the keenest edge, never ceases dividing all things which are perceptible to sense," *etc.* In the others he says that "Abraham, when he began to measure all things, according to God—takes a likeness of the flaming sword (*i. e.*, of the Divine Logos), *to wit*, fire and a sword (*μάχαιρα*), seeking to sever and burn away the mortal part from himself, in order that with his naked intelligence he might soar and fly up to God.—K.].

VER. 12. **And piercing through—feelings and thoughts of the heart.**—These expressions subserve the same purpose as the preceding, *viz.*, to characterize the word of God *as such*. A union of the word of the *Gospel*, or even of the Hypostatical Logos, with the inner life of believers, is not indicated by a single feature of the picture. It simply presents to us the word of God in its proper and peculiar character, as penetrating through every outward and enveloping fold, into the inmost being of man, and thus competent to exercise judicial supervision (κριτικός not κρίτης) over those ἐνθυμήσεις and ἔννοιαι, which, as sources of human action, have their sphere of operation in the heart. The word exercises its judicial functions as well in the realm of thought, purpose and resolution, as in that of affection, inclination and passion; for it penetrates so deeply as to effect the work of separation (μερισμός) in the province of soul and spirit, and that in their natural (though not necessarily, as maintained by Del., sensuous and corporeal) life of emotion and sensibility. For ἁρμοί τε καὶ μυελοί form doubtless a figurative expression for the collective and deeper elements of man's inner nature (as, in the same way, μυελός is found at *Eurip. Hippol.*, 255, and *Themist. Orat.*, 82, p. 857), and were here naturally suggested by the comparison of the "word" with a sword. And we can scarcely apply the language to the separating of the soul from the spirit, or of both from the joints and marrow of the body (Böhme, Del.); or to the penetrating of the word clear to the most secret place where soul and spirit are separated (Schlicht., who, although ἄχρι is not repeated, does not make ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν, dependent on μερισμοῦ, but coördinates them with it). The separation is rather described as *taking place in these designated spheres* themselves, the word, like a sword, cleaving soul, cleaving spirit. HOFM. (*Schriftb.*, I., 259) assumes a very harsh and indefensible inversion, making ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος depend on ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν=alike *the joints and marrow of the inner life*. It is a more natural construction (with Lün., Alf., *etc.*) to take ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν, connected as they are by τε καί into closely united parts of one whole, as subordinate to ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος, thus=*soul and spirit, alike joints and marrow* [*i. e.*, joints and marrow of soul and of spirit]. To assume (with Calv., Bez., *etc.*) a coördination of the two sets of words, as corresponding and similarly divided pairs, is forbidden by the absence of the τε in the first pair; and the order of the words themselves (ψυχῆς, preceding πνεύματος) forbids our assuming, with Delitzsch, an advance from the πνεῦμα, as the primary and proper seat of gracious influences, through the more outward ψυχή to the strictly material and bodily portion of our nature.

VER. 13. **And there is no creature that is not manifest,** *etc.*—At the first glance, the language looks like a continuance of the description of the λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ; and hence many expositors who do not adopt the *hypostatical* view regarding the word, still refer the repeated αὐτοῦ, and the ὅν to λόγος. But although John xii. 48 ascribes to the word a judicial function at the final judgment, and Prov. iii. 16 ascribe *hands* to wisdom, yet still here alike the mention of *eyes*, and the Hellenistic ἐνώπιον corresponding to the Heb. לִפְנֵי, indicate that the subject passes over from the *word* to God Himself. This transition is all the more natural, in that the attributes, previously ascribed to the word, point collectively to its origin from God, and to the power of God prevailing in it. But we are particularly forced to this construction from the final clause πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος. This were an impotent, superfluous and purely objectless addition if it meant nothing but: "of whom we are speaking,"=περὶ οὗ ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος, ch. v. 11 (Luth., Grot., Schlicht., Strig., *etc.*), whether we refer the sentence to 'God' or to His 'word.' Nor does it mean properly: "to whom we have to give an account" (Pesh., Chrys., Primas., *etc.*); but more exactly: "with whom we stand in relation," *i. e.*, of accountability (Calv., Beng., Bl., and the later intpp.). No special emphasis rests on ἡμῖν, and, at all events, none strong enough to support the interpretation which Ebrard, on the strength of it, gives to the passage. The rendering proposed in REUTER's *Rep.*, 1857, p. 27: "to whom (*viz.*, God) the word is for us," *i. e.*, "to whom the word is to lead us," is far-fetched and artificial. Before God, then, there is no creature, ἀφανής, *i. e.*, *invisible and untransparent;* rather (δέ for ἀλλά, as ch. ii. 6) are all creatures, γυμνά, *stript of all natural and artificial covering;* and τετραχηλισμένα, *with neck bent back*, so as to give a full view of the face. The archæological explanations drawn from ancient usages, either in gladiatorial combats, or in the treatment of criminals, or in animal sacrifices, are either unnatural, or superfluous. The explanation of κτίσις, as *opus hominis quia id est velut creatura hominis* (Grot., Carpz.), is decidedly to be rejected. [τετραχηλισμένα (Hesych., πεφανερωμένα) has been explained from the usage of athletes in grasping by the neck or throat their antagonist, and prostrating him on his back, so that he lies *open and prostrate;* or from the practice of bending back the necks of malefactors—who would naturally bow their heads—so that all may see their shame; or, from throwing back the necks of animals in sacrifices, in order to lay them bare to the knife of the slaughterer. The first seems objectionable, as giving to τραχηλίζειν, a meaning, *i. e.*, of *laying prostrate and bare*, which is merely incidental to, and inferential from its proper force, "*seize by the neck, throttle.*" The second, from the fact that, though a Roman custom, there is no evidence that it was expressed by the Greek word τραχηλίζειν. The third, also, is liable to the objection, that, though the usage was familiar to the Greeks, there is no evidence that this word was employed to designate it. The latter view is adopted by Lün.; the second by Bleek, De Wette, *etc.* Alford insists on the frequency of the occurrence of the word in Philo (especially "in a passage cast so much in Philo's mode of rhetorical expression"), (who uses it uniformly in the sense of *laying prostrate*, generally metaphorically), and would thence interpret it here "as signifying entire prostra-

tion and subjugation under the eye of God." WORDSWORTH renders: "*bare and laid open to the neck*, throat and back-bone;" and adds: "The metaphor is from sacrificial victims first flayed naked, and then dissected and laid open by the anatomical knife of the sacrificing Priest, so that all the inner texture, the nerves and sinews, and arteries of the body were exposed to view." —K].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. "The word searches out in our hearts the eternity which hitherto lay buried under a multitude of fancies and imaginations of the heart, and was too feeble to come forth of itself. It creates a spiritual understanding, which consists in true and substantial ideas. It furnishes an answer to the objections which distrust, fear, impatience, unbelief, awaken in our bosoms. It teaches us that there are within us two hostile wills; one from truth, the other from imagination; one from God, the other from ourselves. It separates the desires springing from imperfect education, from misunderstanding of the letter of the law, and those that spring from an uncleansed conscience and habitual desire, and it so judges and uncovers all deception, that nothing is hidden from it. Thus this word is a genuine auxiliary to the attainment of rest." (Hahn, priest in Echterdingen).

2. The word is the *essential means of revealing* the true and living God, inasmuch as He in His essence is *Spirit* (Jno. iv. 24); and since speaking appears in this connection as an *essential living utterance* of God, its product, the word, must contain in itself, and express, the peculiarity of the divine life. Precisely for this reason, *the same qualities* are applied to the Word of Revelation as to the hypostatical Logos, and interpreters could easily question whether our text spoke of the former or the latter. At all events this passage belongs, as already recognized by OLSHAUSEN (*Opuscula*, p. 125); KÖSTLIN, (*Joh. Lehrbegr.*, p. 376) DORNER, (*Christology* I. 100) to those Biblical declarations which explain and prepare the way for the origin of the mode of expression in the prologue of the Gospel of John. For if Christ is conceived, not merely as the mediator of the creation, the redemption, and perfection of the world, but also as mediator of the whole revelation of God; if again the word is the essential means of this revelation, and if, finally, the personal mediator must, in such a relation, be conceived of as of like nature with God, as demanded by the expressions ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, ch. i. 3, and εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως (Col. i. 15), it becomes then entirely natural to characterize the Son of God, not merely as being the *substance* of the announced word, but as the eternal and personal Word, by the appellation of Logos.

3. Although expressions are found in Philo, regarding the cutting and penetrating sharpness of the "word," which are similar to those used here, we are still not to go back to Philo for the explanation of our passage, but rather to conceptions and expressions of the Old Testament which Philo's philosophical speculations not unfrequently obscure and misinterpret. The Word of God is specially compared (Is. xlix. 2) with a sharp sword, and Is. xi. 4 speaks of the rod of His mouth, which will smite the earth, and of the breath of His lips which will slay the wicked. For this same reason similar figures are found at Eph. vi. 17; 2 Thess. ii. 8; Rev. i. 16; ii. 12; xix. 15. The judicial power of the word, which is spirit and life (John vi. 63; Acts vii. 38); is mentioned, also John xii. 48, as at Wis. xvi. 12, its healing, and at Sir, xliii. 26, its all-creating and sustaining power. We might also, perhaps, be reminded of the expressions at Wis. xviii. 15; ὁ παντοδύναμός σου λόγος —ξίφος ὀξὺ τὴν ἀνυπόκριτον ἐπιταγὴν σοῦ φέρων.

4. Since πνεῦμα (spirit) in our passage denotes a constituent element of human nature, and is distinguished from ψυχή (soul) the trichotomical view of the nature of man is here expressed, which is found also 1 Thess. v. 23; while Matth. vi. 25; Jas. ii. 26 point undeniably to that of a dichotomy. But this indicates no contradiction in the Holy Scriptures itself, but simply authorizes both forms of representation. Regarding the contrast of the Scriptural dichotomy with a false trichotomy and in like manner of the Scriptural trichotomy with a false dichotomy, see DEL., *System of Biblical Psychology*, Leipz. 1855, p. 64 ff; OLSHAUSEN, *Opusc. Theol.* p. 152, and LUTZ, *Biblical Dogmatic*, p. 76; VON RUDLOFF, *The Doctrine of Man*, Leipz. 1858; and G. VON ZEZSCHWITZ, *Classic Greek, and the Spirit of the Biblical Language*, Leipz. 1859; p. 34 ff. In the latter work it is well said p. 60 that the Scripture speaks *dichotomically* in respect of the parts, *trichotomically*, of the living reality, but maintaining everywhere the fundamental unity of the human essence. It is entirely false to refer with G. L. HAHN, (*Theol. of the New Testament*, 1 *vol.*, Leipz. 1854, p. 415) the πνεῦμα in our passage to the Spirit of God. According to the view of this scholar, it would be here said, that the Word of God is not despised with impunity, inasmuch as it is able to penetrate into the inmost recesses of human nature, where the soul, the central seat of life, receives from the spirit its contributions and nourishment. Granting, then, that the word is able to separate the soul from the spirit, this means, according to him, nothing else than that the Word of God has power to procure for man the eternal death of the soul. But the *Spirit* is here evidently a constituent element of human nature, which, in its origin, comes immediately from God, and belongs, in its nature, to the immaterial super-sensuous world. In it is involved the continued existence of man, and his entrance after death into the invisible world. The ψυχή (soul) is in this connection the central, and as it were *aggregating* point of human life, which is touched immediately by bodily impressions, but which also receives into itself the influences proceeding from the πνεῦμα. (Riehm, II. 672 ff.).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

He who would attain to the desired goal must not merely *give heed* to the Word of God, but must *strive earnestly* to enter into the Rest of God.—What we have in the Word of God, we best ascertain from its agency and its influence.—The *character* of the Word of God corresponds as well to its origin as to its object.—God *judges* in His word, 1, in order to *save;* 2, the *whole world;* 3, not merely the *walk*, but also the *heart*.—When is our striving a blessed one?—1, When it is directed to the attainment of the Rest of God;—2, when it is directed in accordance with the Word of God; 3, when it comes from a heart which has a living consciousness of its responsibility to God.—What is the nature of that God with whom we have to do?—Does the earnestness with which God desires our salvation find an answering earnestness in our striving after His approval?—To the magnitude of that which God has bestowed upon us, corresponds the weight of our responsibility, and the heaviness of His judgment.

Starke:—Without rest we were the most miserable of all creatures, and it were better for us that we had never been born, than that we remained in eternal unrest. Therefore, take courage, vigorously onward, be active in the struggle, joyful in the course, that we may lay hold of the jewel of rest (1 Tim. vi. 12).—The Gospel is the means which God employs for our salvation. If then, it is to make living men out of dead ones, it must itself be living.—God's Word has God's power.—Observest thou not how it arouses thy conscience and rebukes thee?—God evinces His power in the works of faith and of salvation, no otherwise than through His word, and it also proves itself mighty in those who will not obey the truth, since it becomes to them a savor of death unto death, (1 Cor. i. 24; 2 Cor. x. 4, 5; Rom. i. 16; Ps. xix. 8.)—The law is a sharp sword, which pierces into the soul of a transgressor (Gal. iii. 10); but the Gospel is still sharper in its convicting power; it is able to soften the hardest heart, and to cut it asunder through the preaching of Christ, (Acts ii. 37: xvi. 14, 32; xxvi. 27, 28).—As the word is of divine authority, it is also a perfect, clear, and sure rule of faith.—The power of the word of God evinces itself in this, that without compulsion or external power, it draws hearts to itself, brings them out of the power of the devil, of sin, and of death, into obedience, and brings them to eternal, divine freedom, righteousness and life.—Our heart has frequently been smitten, we know not how or whence. Frequently we hear a whispering, without any sensible emotion. Then again it happens that we hear the same small voice, and taste in it a power, and receive from it a wisdom, that fills us with wonder, (Acts xxiv. 25).—Thoughts are not free from accountability; hearest thou not that they have their judge?—If thou goest about with evil trick and artifices, although they are choked down in the heart, and bear no fruit, they will still be revealed and judged to thine eternal shame, (1 Cor. iv. 5).

Berlenburger Bible:—He who will not hear the voice of God cannot possibly attain to the Rest of God, and although there may be found some who have said that they enjoy rest, they have still only a transitory and self-procured rest; but not a rest in God.—Many thousands have lost their rest because they did not put forth their utmost power in entering into it, (Luke xiii. 24).—Where unbelief puts itself in the way of the word, there the living word proves its power, so as to disclose the condition of the man.—The living Word of God cuts so deep into the soul that the false blood of selfishness, as it were, issues forth, and of necessity, betrays itself.—None is so upright toward thee—of that be assured—as this word.

Laurentius:—With the regenerate the spirit must have sway: the body must be subject to the soul, but the soul to the spirit.—From God nothing is hidden, neither the wickedness of the unconverted, nor the secret desire of believers. He knows and sees all better than we ourselves.

Rambach:—Those greatly err who hold the Word of God to be a dead letter; yet the law cannot make alive, for this is an honor which belongs alone to the Gospel.

Von Bogatzky:—None can have any excuse for remaining dead and inanimate, or sluggish and inactive; because the word is living and powerful.—With the sword of the Spirit must all our enemies be smitten, and not hinder us from entering into the heavenly Canaan.—We have not to do with mere men who formerly wrote the word, and who now preach it; no, we have to do with God Himself, the Judge of all flesh.—The more exalted is the person who speaks to us, the more reverently do we receive the word and obey it.

Rieger:—There arises in the heart, particularly if during many years it has not remained totally estranged from, and indifferent to, the proffers of God, an incredible blending of good and evil, of truth and falsehood, of earthly-mindedness, and occasional longing after something better, of inclination to the obedience of faith, and temptation to depart from the living God. If these remain always blended with each other, then the man always remains hidden from himself, now inclined to be influenced and yield to right persuasion, and now again timid, trembling before the temptation to cast away his confidence. With this he sinks at one time into *fear, without exertion*, and acts as if nothing more were to be accomplished; and at another plunges into self-confident endeavors *in exertion without fear*, without thought of the power of unbelief, from both of which only the call and drawing of God can set us free. From such a labyrinth there would be no escape without this *judicial and serving power* of the divine word, which must divide asunder for us faith and unbelief in their deepest roots, and their inmost and most vital tendencies.

Stier:—The unbeliever already has his judge in the heard but despised word, and his judgment in his heart and conscience.—He who in the deepest, indestructible original foundation of the fallen man, still attests by the voice of conscience His right and His truth, is the same one who now speaks by the word of His grace *unto and into* the conscience.

Von Gerlach:—All that is here said of the word, that is, of the revelation of God generally, holds in the highest degree of the independent, personal, eternal Word which was with the Father, and has appeared among us in the flesh; every individual word of God is an emanation from the eternal Word.—The greater the compassionate grace which God bestows upon us in Christ, the mightier the power of His all-healing and restoring love, so much the more fearful is the responsibility, if we nevertheless despise His word.

Heubner:—The Word penetrates even through the thickest bulwarks of prejudice, of illusion, and into the hardest and grossest hearts; it seizes upon the inmost being, the very vital principle of man.—How often has the declaration of the Bible assailed and completely penetrated the hardened and the transgressor, or a promise awakened the sluggish and the timid.—The power of the word comes from God who has created both the word and the human soul. Even the simplicity of the word strengthens its power.—God knows alike true and wavering faith.

Hahn:—We cannot believe and yet remain idle.—The word will at once render us cheerful, and will help us on if we deal with it honestly and do not weaken its power.—Many would gladly go into rest, but they do not lift up a foot in the right direction.

Fricke:—The goal toward which we tend is indeed rest, but the way is toil and labor.

THIRD SECTION.

I.

Exaltation of Jesus Christ above Aaron and his high-priestly successors.

The exaltation of Jesus Christ, as the High-Priest who has passed through the heavens, furnishes a basis for the exhortation to the maintenance of the Christian confession.

Chapter IV. 14–16.

14 Seeing, then, that we have a great high priest, that is [has] passed into [through]
the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast *our* profession [confession,
15 ὁμολογίας]. For we have not a high priest which [who] cannot be touched with the
feeling of [sympathize with] our infirmities; but was [has been] in all points tempted[1]
16 like as *we are*, *yet* without sin [apart from sin]. Let us therefore come boldly [approach with confidence] to the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy,[2] and find grace to help in time of need [for seasonable succor].

[1] Ver. 15.—The *lect. rec.* πεπειρασμένον is attested by Sin. A. B. D. E., and is to be retained against the reading πεπειραμένον received by Mill, Bengel, Matthäi, and recommended by Griesbach, which would properly mean, "who has made trial of, *expertus*."

[2] Ver. 16.—The form ἔλεος, preferred by Lachm. and Tisch. instead of ἔλεον, has the sanction of Sin. A. B. C.* D.* K. 17, 71.

[Ver. 14.—διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐράνους, *having passed through* (not as in Eng. ver. *into*) *the heavens*: though of course either *might* be said.—τῆς ὁμολογίας, *our confession*.

Ver. 15.—συμπαθ. ταῖς ἀσθενείαις, *to sympathize with our weaknesses*.—κατὰ πάντα, *as to all things*, *in all things*,—καθ' ὁμοιότητα, *according to* or *after our similitude*,—just as we are tempted.—χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας, *apart*, or *separately from sin*; tempted in all things, just as men are tempted, but still totally free from sin.

Ver. 16.—μετὰ παῤῥησίας, Eng. ver. boldly: De Wette, Del., Moll, *mit Freudigkeit*—*with joyfulness*: Lün., *mit Zuversicht*—*with confidence*, as also Del. at 3, 6, nearly, *viz.: joyous, unhesitating, confidence*; Alf., *confidence*.—εἰς εὔκαιρον βοήθειαν, *for seasonable succor*.—K.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 14. **Since, therefore, we have a great high priest,** *etc.*—Delitzsch, disconnecting the *οὖν* from the ἔχοντες ἀρχ., and carrying it over to the κρατῶμεν, makes the ἔχον. ἀρχ. here incidental, and regards the *οὖν* with κρατῶμεν as deducing from the words immediately preceding the duty of steadfast perseverance [so Alf.]. But the position of *οὖν* between ἔχοντες and ἀρχιερέα, shows that, looking back to the entire previous discussion, in which Jesus has been not merely *styled* ἀρχιερεύς, ii. 17; iii. 1 (Thol., De W.), but also been set forth in His personal elevation and majesty (Lün.), the author is drawing the conclusion that we possess in Jesus not merely a Prophet and Messenger of God, Legislator, and Leader, like Moses and Joshua, but *a High-priest* who, precisely on account of this character, can,

as ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας, conduct into the Sabbath rest (σαββατισμός). The epithet μέγας points at once to that elevation of this High-Priest above Aaron and his successors, which is unfolded in this section; for the opinion of John Cappell, Braun, Ramb., Mich., *etc.*, that the epithet μέγας only serves to give to the combination μεγ. ἀρχ. the meaning of *high-priest*, is entirely without foundation. Philo had previously called the Divine Logos μέγ. ἀρχ. (I., 654 *Ed. Mang.*). That the author's special point here is the majesty of this *Christian* High-Priest, is clear from the two appended descriptive clauses, of which the former tells us that this High-Priest has accomplished His course, in order that, exalted above all created existences (vii. 26; Eph. iv. 10), He might receive the Place belonging to Him upon the throne of the majesty of God, i. 3, 13; while the other connects immediately with His special designation as High-Priest the mention of His *Divine Sonship*, which explains this elevation (ch. i. 1, 5; vi. 6; vii. 3; x. 29). The rendering: "who has gone to heaven" (Pesh., Luth., Calv., Ernesti, *etc.*) is erroneous [as also that of the Eng. version, "who has passed into the heavens"]; and no less erroneous is the opinion of Wolf and Böhme, that the appended τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ is intended to distinguish Jesus from Joshua.

VER. 14. **Let us hold fast our confession.**—The circumstance that not merely such a High-Priest as the above exists, but that we already stand in a definite historical relation to Him, whereby He is our High-Priest, forms the ground of the exhortation to the holding fast, vi. 18; Col. ii. 19; 2 Tim. ii. 15 (κρατῶμεν not to be explained as by Tittman, *lay hold of*), of our confession, *viz.*, our entire Christian profession, not merely our confession of Christ as our High-Priest (Storr).

VER. 15. **For we have not an high priest —infirmities.**—The author is not here giving the ground of the exhortation which has already found its reason in the ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχ., but proceeds to elucidate still further the declaration of Christ's High-Priesthood which follows from the preceding discussion, by anticipating and setting aside the thought which might arise that a Messiah who had come from God, and who had gone to God, might perhaps indeed have taken upon Himself the human mode of life, but could scarcely have assumed our entire human nature to the extent of an actual sympathy with our weaknesses and our temptations. An actual *joint endurance* (συμπάσχειν, Rom. viii. 17; 1 Cor. xii. 26) of these sufferings is here not intended. The writer simply affirms a *sympathy*, a *fellow-feeling*, (συμπαθεῖν, x. 34); through which compassion shows itself in emotional participation, and in hearty sympathy with the condition of those into whose circumstances, perils and modes of feeling we are enabled to enter. The ἀσθένειαι are not merely sufferings (Chrys., *etc.*), but our outward and inward infirmities.

But one who has been tempted—without sin.—The δέ stands here as ii. 6; iv. 13, so that the adversative clause contains, at the same time, a heightening and a carrying forward of the thought. Καθ' ὁμοιότητα sc. ἡμῶν is stronger than ὁμοίως. Christ's likeness to us in respect of being tempted extends to every relation with a single, far-reaching exception,—an exception that, in fact, modifies the relation of likeness at every point, *viz.*, *apart from sin* (χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας). This cannot mean, "except in sin," in all other things beside (Capp., Storr, *etc.*); for in that case κατὰ πάντα must have been united immediately with χωρίς, and ἁμαρτίας must have had the definite article. The view of Œcum., Schlicht., and Dindorf, *to wit*, without having stained His sufferings by sin, is unnatural. The common explanation, *viz.*, without His temptation leading Him to sin, is too narrow. The participation of Jesus in every form of human suffering—the actual stirring of His emotions, His complete fellow-feeling with our weaknesses, the reality of His actual temptation,—all have taken place without one single sinful emotion, and without ever finding in Him, as their condition, or point of contact, a single slumbering element of sin. Every thing took place with Him "separately from sin." The sinlessness of the Divine Logos in PHILO, (*Ed. Mang.* I., 562 ff.).

VER. 16. **Let us therefore approach—of grace.**—Since we possess in Jesus Christ a High-Priest who is not merely exalted, but also sympathizing and tried, and who thus has not merely the external position and power, not merely the internal inclinations and volitions, but every possible requisite form of qualification and fitness to be our Saviour, with this the previous train of thought, with its naturally accompanying exhortations, is brought to a sort of temporary, and, as it were, preliminary close. The "throne of grace" is neither Christ (Gerh., Seb. Schmidt, Carpz., *etc.*), nor the throne of Christ (Primas., Schlicht.), but the throne of God. The expression, however, is not intended to suggest the throne which arose upon the lid of the ark of the covenant (Bisp. after the earlier interpp.), but the throne of God in heaven, which at ch. viii. 1 is called θρόνος τῆς μεγαλωσύνης, and here θρόνος τῆς χάριτος, the throne of grace, because from it there descends to us the grace which is wrought through Christ the Son, enthroned at the right hand of God. There is no occasion for interpreting it as the throne which stands upon grace, Isa. xvi. 5; comp. Ps. lxxxix. 15 (Del.), but rather, as that upon which grace is enthroned. The coming or drawing near to this throne, designated by προσέρχεσθαι with an obvious reference to the approach of the Levitically clean to the sanctuary (Lev. xxii. 3), or of the priest to the altar (Lev. xxi. 17), is to be with the bold and joyous confidence (παῤῥησίας) which gives to itself the corresponding expression (ch. iii. 6), and rests upon the assurance of reconciliation with God.

That we may obtain mercy, *etc.*—The object of coming to the throne of grace, which in the Old Testament was made possible by the Levitical sacrifice, in the New, by the sacrificial death of Christ, but in both cases finds the impulse to its realization in the faith of those who stand in need of succor, is the attainment of ἔλεος (*mercy*) and χάρις (*grace*). It is equally unwarrantable (with Lün.) to reject all distinction between these two terms, and with Bisp., to refer the ἔλεος (*mercy*) to forgiveness of sins and

deliverance from suffering, and the χάρις (*grace*), on the contrary, to the communication of the higher gifts of grace. For ἔλεος (*pity, mercy*) always involves a more especial reference to wretchedness, which touches the heart; whether consisting in outward misfortune, suffering, punishment, or inward corruption, guilt and sin, while χάρις (*grace*), on the contrary, looks rather to a mere self-determined and kindly inclination toward those who have neither right nor claim to it. To restrict the words εἰς εὔκαιρον βοήθειαν to the then still existing season of grace, with a reference back to ch. iii. 13 (Bl., De W., Lün.), would indeed be preferable to the wholly vague and indefinite interpretation, "so often as we need help;" yet such a limitation is still less appropriate than (with Thol. and Del.) in reference to ch. ii. 18, to refer it to our weaknesses and need of succor in temptations.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

We must not merely *believe* what is announced to us of Jesus in the Holy Scripture, but also *confess* what we have in this great, and in every respect perfected Mediator of salvation.—This confession presents itself, indeed, in *separate acts*, but the confession itself is a *united and distinct whole;* and the holding fast to this, as the confession of the Christian Church, presupposes in the members of the Church, a vitality, power, and fidelity of personal faith, which should ever be cherished, and by which again, our *joyful access* to the throne of grace is secured under the most painful trials.

2. *The passing of Jesus through the heavens* is not here presented as a parallel with the official and solemn passing of the Jewish High-priest through the holy place, into the Holy of holies.—Rather the return of the *High-priest Jesus*, who, as such, has already made His perfect sacrifice by the offering up of His life upon the cross—*His actual return, as Son of man, to the Father*, is, in our passage, as an extraordinary token of His incomparable majesty, *placed in parallel with His Divine Sonship;* whereby the whole person of the God-man is exalted above all finite beings and localities, and freed from the limitations of time and place, has been brought into full and unrestricted participation in the Divine majesty and glory.—The Lutheran *Dogmatic* has for this reason drawn from our passage a capital proof of its doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ.

3. A contrast of the strongest kind appears in thus setting over against each other the *exaltation* of the God-man above every thing created, and His actual *participation* in human sufferings and fortunes. This participation is of a two-fold character; the one is a sympathizing and ever-enduring compassion, in respect to our needs, in a loving *sensibility and fellow-feeling with* our sufferings; the other is the *sinless* sharing, during his earthly life, not only of our *susceptibility to suffering*, but also of our *liability to temptation*. Both are a *testimony of the perfection of Jesus*, and a *foundation of our confidence* in His help, which we, for this reason, have to implore in our *time of need*. Upon this rests, in great part, the importance of the experiences obtained by Jesus in His human life, in regard to the character of human sufferings and temptations. "As former of the world, the Logos of God knew doubtless what sort of a creature we are; but, clothed with our flesh, He became acquainted with human weakness from diversified and comprehensive experience. His Divine, preexistent knowledge, came to learn that which springs from personal trial."—In these words of Cyrill of Alexandria, cited by Del., comes out rather the importance of these experiences, for the development of the personal consciousness and life of Jesus Christ, which has been touched on elsewhere in our Epistle; the object here aimed at, is the quickening of Christian steadfastness and fidelity, by pointing to His capability, not merely to understand our condition, but by virtue of His permanent connection with our nature, in which He has Himself been once tempted, even now, in His exalted condition, to take livingly to heart our state of need and of struggle.

4. The opinion defended by Menken, Collenbusch, Irving, that Jesus Christ was exempt, indeed, from *actual sin*, but not, in His nature, from *inherited* sin, has, lying at its basis, the endeavor to bring into clear light the reality of His humanity, the historical character of His temptations, and the greatness of His moral power and dignity. But it consists in a false explanation of the phrase, "conceived of the Holy Spirit," in which certainly the phrase, "born of the Virgin Mary," finds its supplementary and correlated truth, and it involves a dangerous confounding of the *actual* nature of fallen humanity with the God-*created* human nature which the Son of God assumed in order to redeem and sanctify humanity. This confusion again, has its ground in an inability rightly to distinguish in the human bosom the *possibility* of sinning, and the *reality of temptation*, from *the commencement of sinful emotion* in the affections (compare ULLMANN, *The Sinlessness of Jesus*, 6th Ed., p. 151 ff., and SCHAFF, *The Person of Christ*, p. 51 ff.).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The duty of *fidelity to our profession: a.* in its ultimate ground; *b.* in its exercise; *c.* in its blessing.—Whence arises the *joyfulness* of our approach to the throne of grace? 1, from the *certainty of our reconciliation* with God through the great High-Priest, Jesus, the Son of God; 2, from the *experience of the sympathy* which Jesus has with our weaknesses, as one who has Himself been tempted; 3, from faith in the power of Jesus for timely succor, inasmuch as He has gone sinless through temptation, and victorious through the heavens.—What most powerfully *consoles* us in our struggles? 1, the testimony in regard to the great High-Priest, Jesus, if we can *jointly confess* it; 2, a *survey* of the temptations which Jesus has endured without sin, if we recognize therein His *sympathy* and His strength; 3, our sure and confident approach to the throne of grace in our *need of help*.—It is not enough that we *hear* of the great High-Priest, Jesus. We must also, 1, *confess* Jesus in faith as the Son of God; 2, comfort ourselves in our temptations with His example; 3, *seek* and *find* from His grace timely succor in our weaknesses.

STARKE:—Take heed that thou do not fall off from the confession of Christ; for He is a

mighty Lord, who can easily punish this thy wickedness; but He is also compassionate and sympathizing, since thou always findest with Him grace, compassion, and succor. Wilt thou then deprive thyself of such blessedness? There are times when compassion and grace are peculiarly needful for us: in our first repentance, when we feel within ourselves nothing but sin, wrath, and curse; in our conflict with spiritual foes; in all forms of trouble, and at the final judgment.—Joyfulness of heart and of conscience render prayer mighty with God. But if we are to attain such gladness we must stand in the state of faith, and of a true conversion (Rom. v. 2; Eph. ii. 18; iii. 12).—Our approach to the throne of God depends upon compassion and grace; these we must take by the hand of our faith which reaches forth after them; and we must find them as a great treasure, which, indeed, has been already obtained, but must still be sought by believing prayer.—We need at all times the compassion and grace of God; for the sake of these we must seek without intermission the throne of grace; but we feel at one time more than at another, our destitution, the assaults of our enemies, the sorrows of this world; for which reasons we must at such times preëminently draw near with reverence to the throne of grace.

Berlenburger Bible:—We have a great High-Priest who consecrates the internal foundation for a holy temple in the Lord, and exercises in all respects His priesthood within us, as He has also outwardly exercised it for us.—A weak faith which confesses itself to be weak, is always dearer to God than a strong faith which regards itself as strong, and is not.—Christ, in all the assaults upon us, is assaulted along with us.—Wrath and judgment are abundantly evident of themselves, and frighten the heart away from God. But grace and love are disclosed only through the Spirit of Christ, who then also works perpetually to this end, that we may learn to have a good conscience toward God, and this through the single perfect Mediator and High-Priest, who again has so won back love, that we can now find a throne of grace in the heart of God, provided only that we knock thereat, and make our supplications in the name of Christ.—*Taking*, *finding*, *receiving*, are all that are of value here, and not any personal work or merit.

Laurentius:—Believers still have weaknesses, but Christ sympathizes with believers in respect to their weaknesses.—We must, 1, *draw near*, since by remaining at a distance from God, and by not being willing to draw near to Him, we could not possibly obtain succor. We must, 2, draw near to the *throne of grace*, since it is through grace alone that man obtains help, not through works. We must, 3, draw near *with joyfulness*, since to have begun to believe, and still be always inclined to doubt, is equivalent to doubting whether God is truthful, whether He is compassionate, whether He is Almighty; and he that doubteth must not think that he shall receive anything from the Lord (Jas. i. 6, 7).

Rambach:—The recognition of the glory of Jesus Christ, and in particular of His High-priestly office, is the most excellent preservative against apostasy.

Von Bogatzky:—Our sins must surely be great, and a great abomination, since so great an High-Priest was obliged to expiate them by the sacrifice of His own life. But man would fain make his sin insignificant and small, and is full of excuse, security, and impenitence, and he thus denies Christ as the great High-Priest, and His great propitiatory sacrifice.

Steinhofer:—With a *disconsolate* heart, bewailing its misery, feeling nothing but corruption, one may yet summon a *confident* spirit to come to Jesus. The sinner may address Him. Before the throne of grace that has been sprinkled with blood, the sinner may present his cause, his whole burden of anxiety.—We may only *come* to the throne of grace, *as we are*, and of our condition present *what we feel*, and ask for *what we need*.—It is simply the result of the same pride with which Satan has poisoned us, if we refuse to throw ourselves upon mere compassion, and in this, let ourselves be looked upon precisely as we are.

Rieger:—*Sympathy* carries us through, and obtains for us that which else a bold claim upon pity might deprive us of. *Compassion* reaches down the deepest into our misery, and is, as it were, the nearest thing for us to receive or lay hold of. Led by this, we always find, more and surer grace for opportune help in every time of need.

Von Gerlach:—We are tempted *by* sin and *to* sin. Christ was tempted in both senses, without sin.—As His kingly office has respect to the annihilation of the dominion of sin, death and the devil, and the restoration of men to the glorious freedom of the children of God, so His priestly office has respect to the doing away of that separation of men from God, which sin has occasioned, and the reëstablishment of their intimate fellowship with Him. The former is preëminently a glorifying of God's omnipotence; the latter preëminently a glorifying of God's love, in the work of redemption.

Stier:—For that in thee which still *loves* to sin, thou shalt find no comfort and no sympathy, but hostility even unto blood, even unto death. But for the new man in thee, who is a member of Christ, and feels and suffers sin with pain, it is to thee truly a great consolation, that He, thy Lord and Head, has *felt* and *suffered* it also.—In our perpetual *drawing near* lies the whole secret of our struggle unto certain victory; in the neglect of this, in indolent and distrustful standing aloof, lies our whole danger of destruction.—Provided that *prayer* persists and becomes earnest *seeking*, we cannot fail to find grace at the throne of grace, where nothing else is to be sought and found.

Heubner:—Christ, as a son, had a right to take upon Himself the creature. As a son, He was an eternal propitiator; God looked upon Him from eternity as the ground of our salvation, and in Him loves from eternity our fallen humanity as reconciled in Him. As son, He remains propitiator through eternity; His propitiation holds good forever, because, through the Son, it is grounded in the nature of God. Were the atonement to lose its efficacy, the Son must cease to have efficacy with the Father, and this is impossible.—In Jesus Christ there is a wondrous

union of loftiest elevation and condescending sympathy.—Both the temptations and the sinlessness of Jesus inspire confidence in the heart.

STEIN:—The freer we feel ourselves from evil, the more painfully must temptations touch us.

FRICKE:—*Having and holding*, belong together.

GEROK:—The lovely paths which open themselves to the Christian from the mount of the ascension: 1. downwards toward earth; *a.* a field of labor for our faith; *b.* a place of blessing for our exalted Saviour. 2. Upwards toward heaven; *a.* a gate of grace for daily joyful approach; *b.* an opened door of heaven for future blissful entrance.

II.

Christ has the characteristic of a High-Priest primarily by His capacity to sympathize with human weakness.

CHAPTER V. 1–3.

For every high priest [being] taken from among men is ordained for men in things
2 *pertaining* to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices[1] for sins: Who can have
compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way [being able to deal
tenderly with the ignorant and erring]; for that he himself also is compassed with in-
3 firmity. And by reason hereof [on account of it][2] he ought [is obliged], as for the
people, so also for himself,[3] to offer for[4] sins.

[1] Ver. 1.—The *lect. rec.* δῶρά τε καί, has the sanction of Sin., A. C. D.*** E. K. L., and all the minusc.

[2] Ver. 3.—Instead of διὰ ταύτην, should be read with Sin. A. B. C.* D.* 7, 80, δι' αὐτήν. [This is intrinsically better, as the unemphatic αὐτήν, *it*, suits better than ταύτην, *this*, with the incidental and parenthetical character of the verse.—K.].

[3] Ver. 3.—The *lect. rec.*, ἑαυτοῦ, is found in Sin. A. C. D.*** E. K. L., and in nearly all the minusc.

[4] Ver. 3.—Instead of ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν, περὶ ἁμ. is, after Sin. A. B. C.* D.* 17, 31, 47, 73, 118, approved by Griesb., and received by Lach. and Tisch.

[Ver. 1.—Λαμβανόμενος, not *taken*=*who is taken*. as if applying to that particular class of high-priests that are taken from among men, in antithesis to Christ; but *being taken*, as a universal and indispensable attribute of high-priests, *viz.*, that they be taken from among men, and an attribute, therefore, which must be shared by Christ.—ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων. *on behalf of men.*

Ver. 2.—μετριοπαθεῖν, not exactly *have compassion upon*, but, "deal moderately, and hence tenderly with;" Moll, *das richtige Mass im Mitleiden einhalten.*—τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσιν καὶ πλανωμένοις, *on the ignorant and erring*, or *straying*. The Gr. Art. not repeated; hence both participles belong to the same subject.

Ver. 3.—ὀφείλει, *ought*, *i. e.*, is bound, is under obligation.—καθὼς, *according as*, marking equality of relations.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 1. **For every high priest—relating to God**—The position of the words forbids our connecting the participle λαμβανόμενος immediately with the subject=*every high-priest who is taken* (Luth., *etc.*)—as if the purpose were to contrast with the heavenly, the earthly high-priest; but requires it to be taken predicatively, as expressing the first requisite of *every* high-priest, *viz.*, that He, as being taken from men, be appointed as religious mediator in behalf of men. Nor is any such contrast of Christ with the human high-priest, expressed as to warrant the interpolated idea of THOL.: "While Christ, through the compassion and sympathy to which His susceptibility to temptation has given rise, becomes (according to ii. 17) a faithful high-priest (πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς), the *human* high-priest, by that liability to temptation which passes over into actual sin, is moved to *indulgence* toward his partners in guilt, and a prompt and willing exercise of his mediatorial office." Of a contrast between the pure sympathy of Christ and the over indulgence of the earthly high-priest, there is not the slightest trace; on the contrary, the sympathy previously ascribed to Christ, was regarded as the most immediate proof of His fitness for the high-priestly office, and as such introduced with a γάρ. Καθίσταται is not middle, but passive, and τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν is not an Accusative of the object (Calv.), but (as ch. ii. 17) a sort of adverbial or absolute Accusative.

VER. 2. **That he may offer—for sins**—Although δῶρα denotes, Gen. iv. 4; Lev. i. 2, 3; bloody sacrifices, and θυσίαι, Gen. iv. 3, 5; Ex. ii. 1; Deut. v. 15, those which are bloodless, still the combination, δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι, points here, as ch. viii. 3; ix. 9, to the well-known distinction between offerings made without bloodshed (expressed by δῶρα, *gifts*), and those which require the shedding of blood (expressed by θυσίαι, *sacrifices*). The words περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν belong neither to θυσίαι alone (Grot., Beng., *etc.*), nor to both nouns conjointly, but to the *verb* προσφέρῃ, indicating that the high-priestly offerings in question—*for those of priests in general* are not here referred to—in which may be included *gifts*, may be conceived as *expiatory*. The author is stating precisely the purpose of the high-priest's religious ministry and mediation.

As one who can deal gently, *etc.*—Μετριοπαθεῖν, is a term that past over (Diog. Laert. *vit. phil.*, V. 31) from the School of the Peripatetics into general use, and which has a double contrast, on the one hand, with the ἀπάθεια, *passionlessness*, which the Stoics demanded of the wise man, and on the other, with *excess of passion* (πάθος) in those who were passionately excited. It is commonly understood, in too narrow a sense, of moderation in *anger*, and of indulgence and gentleness toward the short-coming; for it applies, in general, to the preserving of the proper mean in our emotions, and hence in the case of sufferings denotes steadfastness. This quality was specially necessary for the high-priest; for all crimes, without distinction, could not be equally expiated by sacrifices. On the one hand, therefore, he must not allow himself to be moved by false sympathy to unwarranted offerings, nor, on the other, to be provoked by the constantly recurring demands for intercession and sacrifice, to impatience and hard-heartedness. Wilful and determined transgression of the law demanded even still the infliction of the appointed punishment. For sins that were committed בְּיָד רָמָה, *with upraised hand, i. e.*, in a spirit of haughty violence and insolent defiance of the law of God, the offender was to be cut off from the congregation by death, Lev. iv. 13 ff.; Num. xv. 22 ff. Sins, on the other hand, which were committed *in error* (בִּשְׁגָגָה), so that in the moment of their commission there was but an indistinct consciousness of their nature, admitted expiation by sacrifice. The subject of expiation must then take the victim to be offered from his own possessions, and bring it to the priest who put it to death as a substitute for its owner, after previously ascertaining whether the offence in question fell under the above mentioned category. The expression, τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι καὶ πλανωμένοις, is, however, by no means to be restricted to men who have committed unwitting and involuntary offences; for, on the great day of Atonement, even sins which were not committed thus in error (בִּשְׁגָגָה), and which admitted in the course of the year no expiatory sacrifice, could, under the condition of repentance, receive expiation. Those persons, therefore, are intended, who, in distinction from the impious mockers at the law, disregarded, in their natural and hereditary sinfulness, the Divine will, and by yielding to temptation, fell into error.

Ver. 3, 4. **Since he himself is compassed with infirmity—offerings for sin.**—Ἀσθένεια is here, as at ch. vii. 28, that native moral weakness with which man is encompassed not so much as by a *garment* (Lün.), as by *light*, or by *the skin*, so that he can in no condition of earthly life be conceived as separated from it. The classical form περίκειμαί τι (found elsewhere in the New Testament only Acts xxviii. 20), expresses admirably this condition, so entirely independent of human will. Ὀφείλει points not exclusively to the legal requisition (Böhm., Hofm.), and not exclusively again to a moral necessity, which lies in the very nature of the case, as springing from the like state of infirmity, (Bl., Lün.). Both are blended in the conception of the author (Del.). For not only does the law take for granted (Lev. iv. 3–12) that the high-priest may also in the course of the year find himself under a necessity of offering sin offerings for himself, but on the great festival of atonement, the high-priest, after accomplishing the customary morning sacrifices, was obliged to lay aside the so-called golden garments, and in simple priest's clothes, yet of Pelusian linen, descend from the bathing apartment into the inner fore-court, there lay his hands on the bullock that stood as a sin offering between the court of the temple and the altar of burnt offering, and offer intercessory prayers, first for himself and his house, then for the entire priesthood, and finally for all Israel; prayers which Del. in his history of Jewish poetry, p. 184, 185, has given and explained. The first prayer of intercession ran thus: O Jehovah, I and my house have trespassed, have done wickedly, have committed sin before Thee. O, in the name of Jehovah (according to another reading, O Jehovah) expiate, I pray Thee, the trespasses and the evil deeds and the sins wherewith I have trespassed, and have sinned against Thee, I and my house, as written in the law of Moses Thy servant; "For on this day will he make an atonement for you, to cleanse you: from all your sins shall ye be clean before Jehovah," (Lev. xvi. 30). It was only as having himself received expiation that the high-priest could make atonement for the priesthood and the congregation according, to the principle: Let an innocent person come and make expiation for the guilty, and not a guilty person come and make expiation for the guiltless. Προσφέρειν stands absolutely as at Luke v. 14; Num. vii. 18; comp. Reiche *Comm. Crit.* III. 35.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The idea of the Priesthood* is that of a religious mediation, which, culminating in the *High-priesthood, concentrates* itself in sacrifice, and receives, according to the special character of the religion, its peculiar expression, but reaches in Christianity its adequate realization.

2. Among sacrifices, those which relate to the restoration of that fellowship of man with God, which sin has interrupted, are of the greatest importance; inasmuch as the religious life of the human race in its actual course turns upon, and as it were revolves about, the *realization of the atonement*, as about its central point in the mutual relations of sin and grace.

3. The *institution of the priestly office* therefore originates in the necessities of men who are to be reconciled to God. But for this reason again the priests themselves are taken from men, inasmuch as any genuine intercession with God requires that they know, *from their own experience*, the necessities of sinful men. But from this again it necessarily follows, that they are under obligation to offer expiatory sacrifices, not merely for others, but also for themselves, until the appearance of the sinless High-priest, Jesus Christ.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Our condition summons us primarily; 1, to the *humble confession* of our sinfulness and weakness; 2, to a *fitting sympathy* with the erring and sinful; 3, to the conscientious employment of the appointed means of grace.—True sympathy *springs* from a perception of our own liability to transgression, and *qualifies* us for a consoling ministry.—The *office which is committed* to us does not free us from the sin which cleaves to men generally; but it entrusts to us the *means* of reconciliation to be *impartially* applied in the *conscientious* exercise of our office.

STARKE:—An evangelical teacher, although he walks worthily of the Gospel, must still, in the proper estimate of his own weaknesses, deal with all sinners, in the midst of severity, with tender sympathy and love, by which he will find all the happier entrance into the consciences of his hearers (2 Tim. ii. 24).—The priesthood is certainly to be respected, and they who are called to it are to be honored; but they are not to be too highly and sacredly regarded; for they are also encompassed with infirmity, and are obliged, in due order, to pray as well for the forgiveness of their own sins, as of those of others. (2 Cor. iv. 7).

RIEGER:—God has, even from ancient times, foreshadowed the blessings and the consolations which we have to enjoy in a high-priest, and *in the access to God*, which is obtained *by means* of him. It is a feature of the good and gracious counsel of God, that He takes from the midst of men those whom He deems worthy of this calling and employment. For those who are *taken*, it is an admonition that, apart from that which their office assigns to them, they are in like circumstances with their brethren; and, for those whom they are to serve in their ministry, it is surely encouragement that to some in their midst, freedom '*to draw near to God* has been thus largely opened.—Such a High-priest taken from among men, had thus no ground of self-complacency to exalt Himself above others; but rather to exercise a sympathizing and gentle spirit toward all, and to be well aware of the two abiding sources of sin, *viz: ignorance* and *error*.

HEUBNER:—The need of a priestly office manifests itself in all religions and among all nations. This should make us give attention to the genuine priest.—The office of priest is not instituted for his own sake, but for the sake of others. He is to be a leader of others to God, and his sacred service should be to him a pleasure.—A sympathizing heart, love, is the most indispensable quality of a priest. He is to know men, their weakness, their deficiency, and this should make him sympathizing and attentive; and he should reflect upon his own weakness, in order to become the more patient. Lowliness and self-abasement make us sympathizing.

III.

He possesses moreover this character by His being called of God to this office, and that as antitype of Melchisedec.

CHAPTER V. 4–10.

4 And no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that [in that he][1] is called of
5 God, as [just as, χαθώσπερ][2] *was* [also] Aaron[3]. So also Christ glorified not himself
to be made a high priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to-day have
6 I begotten thee; as he saith also in another *place*, Thou *art* a priest for ever after
7 the order of Melchisedec; Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up [offering up] prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was
able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared [and being hearkened
8 to from his pious reverence]; though he were [was] a Son, yet learned he [*om.* he]
9 obedience by [from] the things which he suffered; And being made perfect, he be-
10 came the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him;[4] Called [being
saluted προσαγορευθείς] of God a high priest after the order of Melchisedec.

[1] Ver. 4.—The Art. ὁ before καλούμενος, is to be erased after Sin. A. B. C.* D. E. K., 23, 37, 44.
[2] Ver. 4.—Instead of καθάπερ, we are to read, with Sin. A. B. D.*, καθώσπερ.
[3] Ver. 4.—The Art. ὁ before Ἀαρών, is to be expunged after Sin. A. B. C. D. E. K. L.
[4] Ver. 9.—According to Sin. A. B. C. D. E., 17, 37, the order of the words is as follows: πᾶσιν τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ.

[Ver. 4.—καὶ οὐχ ἑαυτῷ, *and not for himself*, ἑαυτῷ, emphatic in position.—ἀλλὰ καλούμενος (omitting ὁ), *but being called*—'as being called,' or, "on the ground that he is called."—καθώσπερ.: ὡς, *as*; καθώς, *according as*; καθώσπερ, *precisely*, or, *just according as*.

Ver. 5.—ὁ λαλήσας scil. ἐδόξασεν αὐτόν.

Ver. 7.—δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας, *both entreaties and supplications*.—προσενέγκας, *offering up*, or, *by offering up*; not, "when he had offered up," nor, "having offered up"—εἰσακουσθείς, *being hearkened to*.—ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας, *from* (=*on account of*) *his reverent fear, filial fear*: Moll, *Frömmigkeit, piety*: others, "*aus der Gottesfurcht*."—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 4. **And none taketh upon himself—just as also Aaron.**—The particle *καί* carries back *λαμβάνει*, and connects it with *καθίσταται*, the principal verb of the period (ver. 1), and introduces the second leading qualification demanded in the high-priest, *viz.*, the fact of his being *Divinely called*,—a qualification realized at the very inauguration of the high-priesthood, in the case of Aaron. Böhme, Bleek and Bisping assume without sufficient ground in *λαμβάνει* a paronomasia with *λαμβανόμενος*, ver. 1. The *τιμή*, *honor*, restricted by the article, refers not indefinitely to *any* position of honor whatever, but refers to the special honor here in question, that of the *high-priesthood;* and *'Ααρών* again is not here a collective term for Aaron and his descendants, but Aaron, the individual person, standing as a model and example for all subsequent high-priests, by whom, in common with their head and progenitor, the office was originally held during life, the office alternating between the families of the two sons of Aaron, Eleazer and Ithamar. In a Midrash published by Schöttgen and Wetstein, Moses says to the troop of Korah: "If Aaron, my brother, had taken upon himself the priesthood, ye would be excusable for murmuring against him. But God gave it to him, and he who rebels against Aaron, rebels against God. To which Korah says in reply: 'Think ye that I claim to take the dignity for myself? I simply demand that it pass to us all in rotation.'" Under the Roman dominion, appointments to and removals from the priesthood were made at pleasure, without reference to the descent of the candidate from Aaron. The text, however, gives no warrant to our imagining (with Chrys., Œcum., Theoph., *etc.*) an allusion by the author to this state of things. *Καθώσπερ*, *precisely according as*, *entirely as*. *Λαμβάνειν ἑαυτῷ* does not of necessity involve the idea of *usurpation* (Luke xix. 12). But if a Divine call and personal choice of the position are placed in contrast, then the latter is really usurpation—a fact which Hofm. fails to perceive.

VER. 5. **Thus also Christ glorified not himself,** *etc.*—HOFM. (*Schriftb.* II., 1, 282; 2 Ed. II., 1, 398) says: "It was no act of self-glorification by which the Royal Mediator of salvation became High-Priest; it was on the path of sorrow and suffering that He attained to that glory in which He is now a High-Priest after the order of Melchisedec." But this contrast of *δοξάζειν* and *παθεῖν* anticipates the subsequent discussion. The same is true if we refer the passage to Christ's royal dignity, whether we find the allusion to it in *ὁ χριστός* or in *ἐδόξασεν*. The *δόξα* is but an equivalent to the *τιμή* of ver. 4 (Bl., *etc.*), and the term *ὁ χριστός* is selected because Jesus Christ is regarded here not in His *person*, but in His character of *Messiah*, who, as *Anointed* One, is seated at the right hand of God.

But he who said to him, *etc.*, **as also in another passage.**—The two citations do not express the same idea; nor is the former adduced to prove that Christ is also a High-Priest (Schlicht., Grot., Steng., Ebr., *etc.*), but simply to call to mind the relation previously unfolded, that, *viz.*, which the God who has bestowed this priestly dignity on Christ, sustains as Father to this Anointed One. The second citation from Ps. cx. 4 proceeds to define the priestly position of Jesus, already repeatedly alluded to in a general way, by its special feature, alleging, *viz.*, that its true type is to be found not in Aaron, but Melchisedec. The essential import of the statement is subsequently unfolded. *Τάξις* signifies neither *order of succession* (Schultz), nor *rank*, but *position*, *quality*, *mode*, or *kind*, for which ch. vii. 15 has *κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα*. "Him whom God, in the words, 'My Son art Thou,' declares to be His world-ruling Anointed One, He also, in His words, 'Thou art a Priest,' declares to be an eternal Priest—two closely united and kindred utterances of God's prophetic word in the Psalms" (DEL.).

VER. 7. **Who in the days of his flesh—suffered.**—The *ὅς* refers back to the subject *ὁ χριστός*, to which the Aor. *ἔμαθε* belongs, and of which the contemporaneous circumstances, or the *way* and *manner* of learning, are denoted by the Aor. Part. *προσενέγκας* and *εἰσακουσθείς*. The phrase, "in the days of His flesh," *i. e.*, of His human life on earth, is contrasted with His perfected state, mentioned ver. 9, and belongs to the main verb, *ἔμαθεν*. To *ἔμαθεν* answers *ἔπαθεν*, with an intended assonance. *From that which* (not in general: "by the fact that") *He suffered* (*ἀπό* with *μανθάνω*, as Matth. xi. 29: *παρά*, or *ἐκ*, Matth. xxiv. 32 [Matth. xxiv. 32 has *ἀπὸ τῆς συκῆς*, which would be the more regular construction with *things; παρά* with persons, though the usage is by no means invariable—K.]) *He learned His* (the Art. *τήν* being specific) *obedience*. To put in parenthesis the clause, *καίπερ—ὑπακοήν*, and thus (with Abresch, Dind., Heinr., Steng., *etc.*) carry the *ὅς* over to *ἐγένετο* as its first principal verb, is totally inadmissible. For *καίπερ* can never be constructed with a finite verb which here would be *ἔμαθε* [*i. e.*, although, as being a Son, He learned, *etc.*, which would require *εἰ καί*, or some combination with *εἰ*]. But neither is the clause, *καίπερ ὢν υἱός*, to be connected, as by Chrys. and Theoph., with *εἰσακουσθείς*. For the particle points to some *apparent* inconsistency between the clause in which it stands (*although* being a Son) and the main declaration with which it stands connected. Yet no such inconsistency can be found between the relation of *Son* and the fact of His *being hearkened to* (rather the reverse), but it *does seem* inconsistent with the leading thought of the period which points to Jesus Christ's *humiliation* and to His possession as Man of the first requisite of a high-priest, mentioned ver. 1-3 (just as vv. 5, 6, declare His possession of that second requisite mentioned ver. 4). The "learning of obedience" is a mark of humanity; and even in this fact of the *actual development* of Jesus, would the *actual state* and *condition* of the Son of God, have disclosed itself. But here the question is not of that actual condition, *viz.*, of Christ's essential likeness to and equality with humanity, by virtue of the incarnation. That matter has been previously disposed of. The question is now of His fitness for being a High-Priest, and this by virtue of His sympathy with the weaknesses of men. The emphasis, therefore, rests not on *ἔμαθεν*, *learned*

(Del.), but on the whole closely connected phrase, ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν.

VER. 7. **Offering up supplications—and being hearkened to,** *etc.*—With ἱκετηρία (which at Job xl. 20 is also connected with δέησις) ἔλαια or ῥάβδος [or κλάδος], is originally to be supplied, the word thus properly denoting by ellipsis the olive branch, which was borne in the hands of a suppliant who was imploring help or protection [SOPH., *Œd. Tyr.*, l. 3]: whence arose then the signification of *earnest entreaty*=ἱκεσία, ἱκετεία. It is uncertain whether (Theophil., Bl., De W., Bisp., *etc.*), we are to assume, in respect to the verbal coloring of these clauses, a reference to Ps. xxii. and cxvi. There certainly is none to the loud praying of the Jewish high-priest on the annual day of atonement (Braun, Böhme, *etc.*); most probably [I think *certainly*—K.] reference is here made to the prayer in Gethsemane, and reference in the plural nouns to its successive repetitions. The added clause, "with strong outcry" (μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς), leads Calv., Schultz, Stein, *etc.*, to regard the language as referring, along with these prayers, to the loud crying of Jesus on the cross; Cajetan, Este., Calov, and Strauss, refer the whole exclusively to this latter, and Klee confines it even to the loud outcry with which Jesus died. These applications of the passage are by no means (with De W.) to be regarded as unsuited to the context,* they are rather very natural, inasmuch as the struggling of Jesus with that suffering of death which was inseparable from His Messianic office, and which had long been present to His thought, was not limited to His agonizing supplications in Gethsemane; and the two Aorist participles are not to be resolved by *after that*, *viz.*, after that *He had offered, etc.*, (De W., Hofm.), but *in that* (*viz.*, in that *He offered*, or *by offering*). The words allude, however, preëminently, to the suffering in Gethsemane; and we have here, perhaps, given us, in close accordance with the account of Luke xxii. 39–46, a scene of evangelical history resting upon tradition, which has also found its way even into the text of some recensions of Luke himself. For according to Epiphanius (*Ancor.* 31), the mention of tears is found ἐν τῷ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγελίῳ ἐν τοῖς ἀδιορθώτοις ἀντιγράφοις. Moreover, Luke xix. 41, and Jno. xi. 35, show the Lord weeping; while again, on the other hand, the ἀγωνία of Jesus in the garden (Luke xxii. 44), is not without example in the record of His life, Jno. xii. 27. We may imagine that the picture here drawn sustains a relation to the Gospel narrative like that which Hosea xii. 5 sustains to the wrestling of Jacob at the Jabbok, Gen. xxxii. 26 (Böhme, Del.). Since elsewhere in our Epistle (ix. 14; xi. 4), as in the classics, προσφέρω is connected with the Dative, it is most natural not to make (with Lün.) πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σώζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου dependent on the verb, but on δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας. The mere expression σώζειν ἐκ θανάτου admits indifferently of being referred to deliverance from *peril* of death (Theod., Calv., Bengel, *etc.*) and to rescuing out of *death itself* (Œc., Calov, Este., *etc.*); for which reason Michael., Bl., and others, unite the two. [But most assuredly erroneously. For what our Saviour prayed for, was not to be snatched from death after He had experienced it, but rescued from its impending approach. It was to be saved from "that hour"—to be delivered from "drinking that cup"—to evade the terrible scene whose black shadow was now thrown over His soul, that He prayed, and this was denied Him. Still, as His prayer was made in entire resignation to His Father's will, He was "hearkened to," approved and accepted in it, even though a literal compliance with it could not be accorded to Him. He "was hearkened to," in that an angel was sent to strengthen Him; in that His death was accepted in all its atoning import, and in that He received the full reward of His suffering; that agonizing prayer being only an additional and fuller proof of the depth of His temptations, and the completeness of His resignation.—K.]. *We cannot from this decide* in regard to the sense of the words *Jesus was heard* ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας. We are hardly to interpret this of His being freed from fear, (Ambros., Grot., and many, following the *Itala exauditus a metu*), which Calvin and Schlichting understand, of the *object* of the fear, *viz.*, death. This interpretation would be allowed, indeed, by the ἀπό, and, moreover, εὐλαβεία has, in fact, the meaning of *fear* (Wisd. xvii. 8; 2 Macc. viii. 16). It can, as appears from Sirach iv. 1, 3, pass over into the signification of a fearful holding back, and of shuddering at the contact and infliction of the κρίμα θανάτου; whence Hofm. understands it of Jesus' recoiling from death; and Tholuck, after Aretius, explains it of shrinking, shuddering, *detrectatio*, and reminds us of the εἰ δυνατόν, *if it is possible*, of the prayer in Gethsemane. But εὐλαβεία means assuredly in general, only *thoughtfulness, precaution, foresight*, the right taking hold and grasping of a thing. Thus the fundamental idea points not to *fear of danger*, but to *fear of injury*, which, in the sphere of religion, is *conscientiousness in dealing with our relation to God*, and with the duties which spring from it. Thus this word stands at Luke ii. 25; Acts ii. 5; viii. 2; xxii. 12 (Lachm.); and so our author uses it ch. xi. 7; xii. 28. For this reason we should also prefer the rendering of Luther after the Vulgate, *pro sua reverentia;* and so with all the Greek interpreters, Bl., Lün., Del., *etc.* The preposition ἀπό points not to the *object*, but to the

* [It seems to me (with De Wette) that a reference of the language to the sufferings and exclamations of Jesus on the cross, *would* here be inconsistent with the purpose of the writer. He is pointing ont how our Lord had learned "*obedience* by prayers and supplications to Him who was able to save Him from death." The "obedience" naturally has reference to that which was the object of His crying and supplication, and this is clearly intimated by the expression, "to Him who was able to save Him from death." The natural implication of this language is, that He prayed to be saved from death. Yet the request was refused Him, and He exercised obedience in submitting resignedly to the will of His Father, and going in obedience to that will to the cross. Thus the prayer of Gethsemane: "If possible, let this cup pass from me," with the accompanying submission of the whole matter to the will of His Father, and the subsequent obedience in going to the cross, are here clearly portrayed, while "the strong crying," which is unmentioned in the Gospel, is here added as a natural, and we may add, almost necessary adjunct of the scene; for we could scarcely conceive those agonizing prayers and the bloody sweat, as unaccompanied by the loud outcry here mentioned: and altogether the prayer, the cry, the sweat, are probably parts of the evangelical tradition regarding that critical scene in the life of our Lord. The death scene on the cross took place when the Son had substantially obeyed; the crisis was over, and Jesus had already accepted His destiny.—K.].

ground of the hearing [*i. e.*, not being hearkened to so as to be delivered from the thing feared: but hearkened to from=in consequence of His filial reverence]; and is used as at Luke xix. 3; xxiii. 41; Acts xii. 14; xx. 9; xxii. 11.

[I have explained above the force of εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπό correctly interpreted by the author "being hearkened to from, *i. e.*, in consequence of his pious reverence." He was hearkened to none the less now than when as at John xi. He said, "I know that thou hearest me always." His prayer was couched in such a perfect spirit of *resignation*, that He was heard in it none the less approvingly, notwithstanding that the specific thing prayed for was not, and could not be granted. And it was only the most dreadful suffering and temptation that could have wrung out, even from the human weakness of the Saviour (and even with this all important qualification), the prayer, the granting of which would of course have nullified the entire purpose of the Saviour's incarnation.—K.].

Hofm. regards the offering of prayers and tears as a *sacrificial* act, and places it, as standing connected with human weakness, in express parallel with the προσφέρειν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, which, in the case of the high-priest, must, of necessity, precede his bringing the offerings on behalf of the congregation (of course with the distinction which exists between the weakness of the sinful high-priest, and that of the sinless Saviour). But this idea, which Del. takes unnecessary pains to refute, is expressly contradicted by the passage vii. 27.

VER. 9. **And being perfected**, *etc.*—The ὑπακοὴ πίστεως, Acts vi. 7: Rom. i. 5, is the condition of the attainment of salvation, of which Christ, in His ὑπακοή, is the author to them that obey Him. On both sides, alike in Saviour and saved, the moral character of the relation is strongly emphasized, and at the same time, the πᾶσιν, *to all*, brings out the universality of the design of this salvation, as the term *eternal* (αἰώνιος), designates its nature, Isa. xlv. 17; while its realization among men demands, on the one side, the perfection of the life of Christ, and on the other, the imitation of His life. The connecting point of these ideas, lies in the fact that Christ has not otherwise been perfected, and elevated to the participation of Divine glory on the throne of the Heavenly Majesty, than by the voluntary offering of His life, morally perfected amidst temptations and sufferings. Thus He has become not merely a priestly king, but *a high-priest after the order of Melchisedek*, and as such He is not so much *prophetically designated* by God in Ps. cx. 4 (where we have barely ἱερεύς), but *solemnly greeted on His arriving at perfection*, as shown by the Aor. Part., προσαγορευθείς, which expresses an act contemporaneous with the ἐγένετο. The author thus says that the prophecy has been fulfilled, and so fulfilled that yet a new feature, that of the *High*-Priesthood, is to be conceived as jointly included (Hofm.).

[The reader will notice some verbal allusions and contrasts in this passage, not unworthy of attention. Christ prayed to Him who was able to *save* (σώζειν) Him from a momentary death,—for such a σωτηρία,—yet did not receive it, but passing through it, became the author of an *eternal σωτηρία* to His people. Again He submitted to this death in ὑπακοῇ, *obedience*, to His Father's will, and thus became πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ, *to all who obey Him*, the author, *etc.* Thus the *saving* from physical death which He prayed for, is contrasted with the *eternal saving* which He bestows on His people; and the *obedience* which led Him to submit to that death, is paralleled with the *obedience* which enables them to reap its fruits in eternal salvation.—K.].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. For the legitimate exercise of an office, personal *fitness*, is not sufficient; there is demanded for it especially *a regular call*, which has its *origin* in God, and in times of disorder and convulsion, receives and finds in God its *reëstablishment*. The *modes* of calling may therefore be very various, and it is specially necessary to distinguish the forms, which, in times of *great national convulsion, God has instituted for promoting the objects of His kingdom*, from those which, in definite social relations and spheres of life, are established by virtue of human laws, on behalf of right and justice, for the attainment of specific ends.

2. That, however, under all circumstances, we are to proceed *in accordance with the Scripture*, and that, even in unwonted cases, God, as a God of order, proceeds according to *recognized laws*, and in harmony with His *holy revelation*, is clear from the example of Jesus Christ, and the relation of His high-priesthood to that of Aaron and Melchisedek. All three are ordained of God for definite periods and circumstances; and the Holy Scripture discloses perfectly their mutual relations, so far as they are important to the history of redemption. The Aaronic priesthood, with its legal, hereditary succession and Levitical character, is expressly designated as simply an intervening and preparatory stage. The union of the priestly and kingly offices in Melchisedec, appearing as an insulated fact, and without the precincts of the covenant people, is stripped of its apparently purely accidental character, and elevated to a type of that which, within the sphere of the covenant people, was, in the person of the Messiah, to stand forth in closest connection with the history of salvation. But Jesus, although Son of God, has still, in no self-willed and arbitrary manner, taken this dignity to Himself, but in the way which had been previously announced, has been placed in it by the Father.

3. True *preparation* for an office which is to subserve the honor of God and the salvation of men, is acquired not by amplitude of knowledge and of skill, but by *learning of obedience*, by which the whole person is prepared to be a willing and capable instrument for the Divine counsels. In this way Jesus Himself has been perfected, and for this reason draws all who believe in Him into the fellowship of His conflicts and His victories, of His sufferings and His blessedness.

4. The hardest thing to *conceive* is that *the sufferings of the pious*, and among them again those of the Son of God, lie *within the sphere* of the Divine counsels, and possess a *healing and saving power*. And the hardest thing to *render* is obedience, which not only abides by and accomplishes the will of God *amidst sufferings*, but *in the suffer-*

ings themselves, shall perceive and prove the Divine will as *a will of love*, and to evince and maintain the *harmony* of our personal will with the will of God, by *a free reception* of the destined and allotted suffering.

5. As principal *auxiliaries* in this conflict of faith and suffering, we have given to us the certainty of the hearing of prayer, the consoling assurance of our ultimate personal perfection, and the power of communion with Jesus Christ. For Christ is to us, not merely an *example and pattern*, but to them that *obey* Him, He is the author of eternal salvation, after having been Himself *perfected*. His perfection refers, on the one hand, to His office of high-priestly Mediator; for, after that He had become obedient unto the death of the cross (Phil. ii. 8), He passed into His state of exaltation in which His merits should retain an everlasting efficacy. But this *perfection of His career*, dependent on the fulfilment of His calling, presupposes, on the other hand, that *complete unfolding of His personal character*, which was dependent upon His actual humanity. Faith in the concrete unity of the life of the God-man, requires the application of the idea of development to His entire personality, after the example of Luke ii. 52. But faith in His *sinlessness* excludes every thought of moral deficiency, and of a gradual triumph over it by the process of development. His *learning* of obedience, denotes not a transition from disobedience to obedience, but the practical power and depth of His personal experience of that which is connected with human life.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Christ is *High-priest* by virtue of His suffering of death; He is a high-priest *forever* after the order of Melchisedec, by virtue of His exaltation upon the throne of God.—The priesthood of Christ is partly an office *committed* to Him, partly a calling *obtained* and *won* upon the path of suffering.—In accordance with a divine *calling*, we are to deem no service, and no sacrifice too heavy, and are in this to take Christ as our *pattern* and our *helper*.—The school of suffering, in which we learn obedience, is the longest and severest; but is productive of the richest fruits.—*Our way to glory* and eternal blessedness, leads through suffering which God ordains after the example, and through the help of Jesus Christ.—No period of life is secure from *suffering;* no rank and condition form a protection against it; no virtue and no merit are secure against it; but it serves to the children of God as a means of *discipline in piety*, and aids in time to the *perfecting* of our life for eternity.—Prayers and tears are an aid to *willing* obedience.—Only those sufferings which resemble *Christ's conflict of suffering*, can comfort, purify and save.

STARKE:—Observe how deeply Christ was humiliated, how zealously He prayed, how obedient He proved Himself. Do thou also learn from Him, this zeal in prayer, this obedience in suffering.—Our prayers and thanksgivings are also offerings, yet not propitiatory; but prayer and thank-offerings, that we may evince our faith and thankfulness of heart.—Jesus, since He was the Son of God, and still took upon Himself sufferings, to which he might undoubtedly have remained superior, proves thus that He suffered not from compulsion, but with the most perfect willingness.—Christ renders those blessed who are obedient to Him. No others become partakers of His salvation.—The offering of the Lord Jesus on the tree of the cross is the grand feature of the atonement made on our behalf, and of all the glory connected therewith.

RIEGER:—If in our human hearts there can be wrought by the Spirit of God groanings which are not to be uttered, oh, then, what prayers must the Eternal Spirit, through whom our great High-priest offered Himself to His God, have called forth in Him: What sanctifying of God, of His name, counsel and will; what justifying of His judgments; what a piercing to the depths of His love; what appeal to His omnipotence; what subjection to His sovereign decree; what submission under all that was outwardly most painful and ignominious, and what a tenacious hold by hope on all that is most glorious, were united, together in this prayer!—For this reason was the suffering of Jesus so mighty to expiate the sins of the whole world, because, in His suffering He so justified, in the prayer of His willing spirit, the judgment of God upon sin, and yet was not to be drawn away from His trust in Him who had placed Him in this office.—Dread, fear, is the sharpest sting in suffering. This the Saviour was unable to escape particularly for the sake of needful sympathizing with us. There He experienced how weak one might be amidst entire willingness of spirit, so long as one is in the flesh; now He knows also what it is "to be heard."—Jesus had already previously evinced so much willing, joyful obedience in His heroic course from the Father, through the world, to the Father; but now He learned what is the deepest element in all obedience, *viz:* that in suffering two separate wills come into conflict with each other, of which the one must be subjected to the other; the will of the flesh and the will of the spirit.—Christ now devotes just as much fidelity to the carrying out and perfecting of our salvation, as He did formerly to the obtaining of it.—Weakness of the flesh becomes sinful when it would subdue the willingness of the spirit; but if we cry to God in prayer, so that we are heard and delivered from it, it becomes the appropriate discipline under which we learn and practice obedience.

HAHN:—Christ knows from experience what belongs to a happy emerging from trial and suffering. Now He most sympathizingly pleads our cause with His Father.—The will and calling of the Father are clear from the fact; 1, that the Father Himself, as it were, *schooled* His Son thereto in the days of His flesh; 2, that the Father Himself perfected Him and made Him the pledge and surety of our salvation.

HEUBNER:—Tears are a sign of strong, fervent, earnest prayer, and prayer a sign of the holy nature of tears.—Christ must be to us a consolation and a source of quickening that we may not withdraw ourselves from the school of God.—Sufferings lead to perfection, and produce the most blessed fruits.—None, least of all the priest, should push himself forward into office.—He who arrogates to himself honor is not worthy of it.—The Divine call ensures an hon-

orable office.—Because God calls, we must serve.—Christ is appointed of God; His dignity, His right, are founded upon God's ordination.—The Divine Sonship of Christ was the first ground of His priestly dignity. To this God has borne witness in His word.

STEIN:—Called long since by the Father to be High-priest, the Son proves in His human lowliness that he is able worthily to fulfil such a calling.—He who pushes himself forward prematurely is led by empty honor; an office which is administered in a Christian manner and spirit brings with it true honor.

HEDINGER:—Personally tried, ready to believe, willing to help; all these united thou hast in thy Saviour.

PART SECOND.

Exaltation of Christ as the single Priestly King, the antitype of Melchisedec.

FIRST SECTION.

TRANSITION TO THIS DISCUSSION BY MEANS OF CENSURE, WARNING, CONSOLATION, AND EXHORTATION.

I.

The readers are still deficient at the time in the right understanding of this typical relation.

CHAPTER V. 11–14.

11 Of whom [concerning which] we have many things to say, and hard to be uttered
12 [to be explained], seeing ye are [have become, γεγόνατε] dull of hearing; for when [while] for [on account of] the time ye ought to be teachers, ye [again] have need that one teach you [again *om.*] which be [what are] the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat [solid food].
13 For every one that useth *milk* is unskilful [inexperienced] in the Word [doctrine] of
14 righteousness, for he is a babe; but strong meat [solid food] belongs to those that are of full age [the mature, τελείων], even those [*om.* even those] who by reason of use [habit, ἕξιν] have their senses exercised [disciplined] to discern [to distinguish] both good and evil.

[Ver. 11.—περὶ οὗ, *concerning whom*, referring to Christ, not Melchisedek; or, better, *concerning which matter, viz.*: Christ's Melchisedek priesthood.—ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος πολὺς καὶ δυσερμηνευτός, *our discourse is extended and hard to be clearly expounded or set forth.*—γεγόνατε, *ye have become*, not, *are*. The difference is important, as marking a lapse from a better spiritual state.

Ver. 12.—Ὀφείλοντες εἶναι, *being bound*, or *under obligation to be—while ye ought to be*—διὰ τὸν χρόνον, *on account of the time*, better than Eng. ver., *viz.*: "*for* the time," which is awkward, if not obscure.—πάλιν χρείαν, *ye again have need*: the πάλιν clearly belongs to ἔχετε, not to the following διδάσκειν. For τινά or τίνα, *viz.*: "of *some one's* teaching you the first principles," or "of our teaching you *what are* the first principles," see exegetical notes.—Καὶ οὐ στερεᾶς, καὶ is omitted by B.[3] C. 17, Vulg., Copt., Orig., and by Sin.

Ver. 13.—ἄπειρος λόγου δικ., *inexperienced, unskilled in respect of a discourse* or *doctrine of righteousness*, so that he is unable as a νήπιος to enter into and comprehend it.

Ver. 14.—διὰ τὴν ἕξιν, *on account of habit.*—γεγυμνασμένα, *disciplined, trained, exercised.*—αἰσθητήρια, *organs of perception*, senses.—διάκρισις, *discrimination.*—K.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 11. **Concerning which we have many things**, *etc.*—The περὶ οὗ is not to be referred merely to Melchisedec (Pesh., Calv., and the majority) or to Christ (Œc., Primas.), but to the preceding declaration that Christ is a High-Priest after the order of Melchisedec; and the οὗ is to be taken, either with Lün. as masc., or with Grot., *etc.*, as neut. Erasm. and Luther translate, *we might have*, instead of *have*, contrary to the tenor of the following part of the Epistle. [Alford still refers οὗ to Melchisedec. But there is not the slightest ground for supposing that the author felt any difficulty in making clear any facts concerning Melchisedec, upon whom, indeed, he dwells very briefly, and without any seeming consciousness of any thing specially difficult to understand in the accounts concerning him. The difficulties regarding the person of Melchisedec, are the result of a gratuitous misapprehension of the strong statements of the writer. The really difficult topic is either Christ as High-Priest, or as Melchisedec-Priest, or, taking the pronoun as neuter, the *topic* of Christ's Melchisedec priesthood.—K.]. Luther also overlooks the γεγόνατε, *ye have become*. The dulness or spiritual hardness of hearing of the readers is not designated as a natural trait, but as the result of a retrogradation which has no apology in their history and outward condition. Hence, with respect to the topic about to be treated, the author feels a difficulty in finding proper expression for the clear communication of that which, in its subject matter, is so rich and various.

VER. 12–14. **For when, on account of the time, ye ought**, *etc.*—Instead of becoming capable of teaching, the readers have become in need of learning; and, indeed, to the extent that they have fallen back to that infantile age which requires milk, and have thus fallen into the danger of losing entirely their power of spiritual discrimination. In vv. 13 and 14, the author expands the figurative mode of expression which he had employed at the close of ver. 12, and at the same time justifies its import. He has the readers in his eye, but the expressions are entirely general. The generality, however, affects only the form. As a matter of fact, the condition of the readers is directly included and characterized. Every one who receives his allotted food in the form of milk, that is, finds himself in the condition of a suckling, is inexperienced, not merely in Christianity (Lün.), or in the specific doctrine of justification by faith (Bl., Thol., Ebr.), or in the doctrine which leads to righteousness (Riehm, De W.), or in righteous, *i. e.*, right-teaching discourse (Del.), so that the capacity of speaking in regard to spiritual things, according to the law and pattern of truth, would be wanting, but in the λόγος δικαιοσύνης of every kind. This has its ground in the nature of a νήπιος (Deut. iv. 39; Isa. vii. 16; Jonah iv. 11). Solid nourishment, on the contrary, corresponds to the nature and the wants of the *mature*, who possess organs of perception (αἰσθητήρια) for the distinguishing of what is wholesome and what is pernicious, and these, indeed, as disciplined διὰ τὴν ἕξιν. Ἕξις is the *habitus*, *holding*, or state acquired by exercise, in its permanent character or result, as *skill*, *readiness*, *capacity*. It is doubtful whether we are to accentuate τίνα or τινά. The latter was preferred among the ancients only by Œc., then by Luth. and Calv.; more recently by Böhme, Bl., Ebr., Lün., Bisp., Alford, *etc.* But the grammatical construction does not demand this reading; rather the active construction [as of διδάσκειν=*that one teach you*] apart from the doubtful reading, 1 Thes. iv. 9, is frequent also in the classics (Win. p. 303, *Madvig. Synt.* § 148–50), and the connection rather favors the other form; for the readers are not sunk to such ignorance that *somebody* would be required to instruct them again, like catechumens, in the very first elements of Christianity; they have rather but an imperfect and dulled apprehension, so that they do not sufficiently distinguish what are essential and incidental matters, what is fundamental, and what is secondary and derived; and they have fallen into danger of forgetting and denying the essential distinction between Christianity and Judaism.

[Alford, ingeniously enough, perhaps, but, I think, with very slight ground of probability, defends τινά, *some one*, as containing a sort of subtle irony, as if the readers were ignorant of that which *any one* was competent to explain. Moll argues against this reading on the ground that the readers had not sunk to that degree of ignorance, that they required to be instructed over again like catechumens in the elementary principles of Christianity. Delitzsch regards the τινά, thus accentuated, as simply feeble. This objection need not, indeed, be pressed, and this rendering gives us, perhaps, the easier construction. The other, *viz.*, that preferred by Del., Moll, De Wette, is more difficult, but more forcible: "need of [one's] teaching you what are the first principles," *etc.* In this case we might expect διδάσκεσθαι, *being taught*, but the harshness of the form would be a sufficient reason for the author's avoiding it, and preferring the not unallowable active. With this reading, again it is doubtful whether we are to explain τίνα as=ποῖα, *of what sort*, which it easily may be, or whether, with Moll, we are to regard the writer as declaring that the readers have sunk into a state of incompetency to discern between capital and incidental, between fundamental and secondary truths, and thus render it simply *what*, which I prefer.—K.].

The λόγια are not the words of the Old Testament, or of the prophets (Peirce, Steng., Dav. Schultz, *etc.*), but the declarations of the Christian revelation, whose fundamental elements constitute the basis of instruction, and at the same time contain its rudimentary principles. The idea of *rudiments* contained in τὰ στοιχεῖα, is heightened by the addition of τῆς ἀρχῆς (Calv., Lün.).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. What in our condition as Christians we have learned of Christianity, we are not to keep for ourselves; but we are rather to be ready to *communicate* Christian knowledge and our evangelical experience, and to regard it as belonging to our calling, not merely to render an account of the ground of the hope which is in us, to him

who demands it, but to make known the evangelical truth which aids our Christian life, and, so far as is in us, in every direction remove ignorance in spiritual things, and come to the aid of the weak.

2. Among these things to be communicated, there are found those which, on account of the variety of relation in which they stand, or on account of the depth of the thoughts which they express, *are hard to be made clear*, and can only with pains be brought within our apprehension. This difficulty is, in certain matters, heightened by the condition of the learners, and that even to the degree that the continuous development of the thoughts is obliged to be interrupted.

3. This state of things, however, does not exempt him who is called to make the communication from the duty of seeking in other ways points of contact by which he may promote their fellowship, and may act directly on those who may lag behind. In the place of doctrinal instruction, comes the *anxious practical appeal*, which awakens the conscience, discloses the inner ground of their sluggishness, and penetrates to the very roots of their spiritual life. The ethical element in teaching has its own intrinsic efficacy.

4. Among those who are left behind are found, along with those of feeble endowments and of imperfect spiritual development, also those who have *gone back*. These latter can all the less dispense with special moral and religious culture, in that their backslidings have reference not merely to knowledge, but even in this respect have their ground in a decline of spiritual life, and precisely for this reason generate and diffuse not merely defective views and fragmentary knowledge, but a confused conception and a perilous dimness of vision regarding even the fundamental principles of Christian truth.

5. For this reason there is needed by the teacher the gift of the *discerning of spirits* (1 Cor. xii. 10), wisdom even in *withholding* instruction, and the art of rightly *dividing the word* (1 Tim. i. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 2). For this he must himself persevere in the practice and discipline of constant learning and prayer (Jas. i. 5); that he may not only use law and Gospel seasonably and in due order, but may also understand how to furnish milk to the children and solid food to the mature (1 Cor. iii. 2).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Failure in fidelity begets failure in our experience in spiritual life; and failure in experience produces failure in the understanding of the word of God.—The important matter is, not how long one has been a Christian, but how earnest he has been in his Christian profession.—Without exercise, there is not the needful progress either in Christian knowledge or in Christian life.—There is but one truth for those of riper age, and for the immature; but there are different modes of communicating and of apprehending it.—Inexperience in the doctrine of righteousness is the worst ignorance: *a.* on account of its origin; *b.* on account of its consequences.

Starke:—In the knowledge of salvation and of Divine things, we must increase daily, each according to his capacity.—The difficulty of some things in Scripture lies not in the things themselves, but properly in the hearer or reader (2 Pet. iii. 16).—Preachers must sometimes address their hearers even sternly, in order that they may be aroused in their state of ignorance, and out of their sluggishness.—The peculiarity and duty of *men* in Christ is that they teach and advance others, not only in respect of knowledge, by words, but also in practice, by their edifying example.—Oh! how many children of God continue like children under age in the very rudiments of spiritual life.—Children, so soon as they are capable of learning, must be brought to the blessed knowledge of the Gospel; the more advanced they are in years, so much the more should they be advanced also in knowledge; otherwise their age becomes a reproach to them.—Search, and inquire: what is still wanting to me? Thou wilt find that thou art still deficient in many things. Go on; make progress during thy life in learning and discipline, 1 Thess. iv. 1, 10.—Since disciplined spiritual senses are demanded for the discrimination of good and evil, and these are found only with the regenerate, no unconverted man can make the true spiritual distinction between good and evil, although, according to his literal knowledge, he may speak very fluently regarding it.

Rieger:—The more spiritual a thing is in its nature, with the more difficulty does it find an entrance, so long as the unspiritual and ungodly nature which has so deeply penetrated our being, still so greatly preponderates.—He who does not cause every thing to take effect with himself for his strengthening and growth in the inner man, but overloads himself in many things merely with fragmentary knowledge, will at last so entangle himself that he will no longer know any thing as he ought to know it.—Milk itself may be gradually transformed into stronger food.—The chief confusion arises from the fact that every one so easily exaggerates that which meets his fancy, and is so sluggish toward that which is fitted to introduce him into the true middle path.

Hahn:—Great truths demand also a certain spiritual age and disciplined senses.—If one does not correctly understand a thing, let him first seek the fault in himself, and administer proper self-rebuke.

Heubner:—The riches of Christianity are inexhaustible; the progress of the learners frequently falls short of our expectation.—The Bible Christianity gives various spiritual nourishment. In the contemplation of Christian knowledge there are different stages of maturity, different powers and susceptibilities. We must strive for the highest reach of Christian maturity and power.

Steinhofer:—If we have trodden the paths of conversion, and, from a general knowledge, have known and apprehended the salvation of Jesus for our fainting soul, and have thus been taught to hold Jesus dearer than all things else, then it becomes preëminently important for daily growth in spiritual life, for a more thorough grounding in our fellowship with Jesus, for daily food for the spirit, that we search more closely

and more profoundly into the knowledge of Jesus.

Fricke:—What we have apprehended in faith must be thought through, and lived through, by each one in his own way. Thus we become strong.

II.

Hence the summons to the readers to strive after Christian maturity and perfection.

Chapter VI. 1–3.

Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on [let us hasten
on, *φερώμεθα*] unto perfection: not laying again the [a] foundation of repentance from
2 dead works, and of faith toward God, Of the doctrine of baptisms and of laying on
3 of hands, and of resurrection of the dead and of [*om.* of] eternal judgment. And this
will we [or, let us] do,[1] if [provided that, *ἐάνπερ*] God permit.

[1] Ver. 3.—Instead of ποιήσομεν, we are to read ποιήσωμεν after A. C. D. E., 23, 31, 39. The Ind., however, is found in Sin. [in Cod. Vat., and is retained by Tisch. The meaning is good with either reading; in my opinion, equally good or better with ποιήσομεν.—K.].

[Ver. 1.—*φερώμεθα, let us hasten onward, speed forward.*
Ver. 3.—*ἐάνπερ, precisely if—provided that.*—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. Wherefore leaving the first principles, *etc.* (Lit. the doctrine of the beginning of Christ).—Taken *grammatically*, it is commonly considered that these words may with about equal propriety be regarded either as the *declaration of the author* respecting his *purpose*, leaving behind him the elementary doctrine of Christ, to advance to perfection in his *teaching* (Erasmus, Luth., Grot., De W., Thol., Bisp., *etc.*), or as a summons to the readers, *himself included along with them*, to strive after their subjective perfection (Chrys., Lün., *etc.*).*—The latter view, however, is decidedly favored by the form of the sentence, connected as it is by *διό*, as an immediate deduction from the preceding; by the fact that *τελειότης* retains thus the sense which has been just previously assigned to it; and finally the declaration in ver. 4 ff.—The contents, however, of *the participial clauses* (not laying again the foundation, *etc.*) might warrant the supposition that the plurals (*καταβαλλόμενοι*, *etc.*) have here mainly reference to the author, for which reason Del. and Riehm unite both ideas, regarding the plural of the *principal verb* as having unquestionably a common reference. The *φέρεσθαι* denotes a movement toward the goal under a rapid and impetuous guidance. The genitive *τοῦ χριστοῦ* depends not upon *ἀρχῆς*, but upon *λόγον*, which latter word is more exactly defined by *τῆς ἀρχῆς*.

Not laying again a foundation, *etc.*—Those portions of doctrine are here commonly supposed to be referred to, which seem to have constituted the catechetical instructions of the early Church. Some old expositors even understand the words *ἐπὶ θεόν* directly of *Christ*, in order to include the indispensable cardinal doctrine of faith in Christ, and appeal in support of their view to Rom. ix. 6; while others maintain that Christian faith, as such, is of course taken for granted, and needs, therefore, no special mention. There is even an American sect that regards precisely the six articles here named as the proper cardinal doctrines of Christianity. With a correct perception of the incongruity of the whole passage as thus interpreted, Ebrard proposes to go back to the original signification of *καταβάλλειν*, *to cast down, overthrow*, which is also adopted by the Itala, and to take *πάλιν* in a privative or *reversing* sense, as Gal. iv. 9; Acts xviii. 21, explaining the absence of the article before *θεμέλιον*, partly from its frequent omission in our Epistle, partly from the fact that it is sufficiently explained by the accompanying Genitives. But this artificial resort to an unnatural interpretation is totally unnecessary. For here first, 1, the author is not speaking of specifically Christian doctrine, but of those which the Jews had in common with the Christians (Beng., Thol., *etc.*), and in which the distinctive Christian features might easily be

* [Some, however, as Owen and Delitzsch, conceive it possible to unite both meanings. To these also Alford partially attaches himself, considering "that on the one hand, *θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι* can hardly be properly said of any but a *teacher*; and on the other, ver. 4 ff., *ἀδύνατον γάρ, etc.*, must necessarily have a general reference of warning to the readers.—The whole, then, is a *συγκατάβασις* of the writer to his readers. He, with his work of teaching, comes down to their level of learning, and regards that teaching and learning as all one work going on together: himself and them as bound up in one progress. Thus best may we explain the expressions which oscillate between writer and readers." So Alford. While holding clearly that the main tenor of the passage has reference to the spiritual progress of the hearers, and that the general urbanity of the writer would be sufficient to account for the first person plur., and while also conceiving that *καταβαλλόμενοι θεμέλιον* may refer not inaptly to the readers, I yet concur with Alf. in finding a little coloring in this phrase drawn from his position as teacher.—K.].

lost sight of, if those purely elementary and fundamental principles of doctrine were held as if ultimate and final. In the second place, 2, the question is not of *fundamental articles* of Christian doctrine, but of such fundamental points as must be presupposed in the case of the readers. And finally, 3, the question is not *exclusively of doctrine*, but primarily of repentance and conversion from dead works, and of that turning to the living God which corresponds to this act. This is the basis on which the readers are so to advance that they shall not always be laying foundations anew; but on the foundation already laid be brought on their part to Christian perfection as well in character and in action (Chrys., Œc., *etc.*) as in intellectual ripeness and maturity. The works are called dead, not because, as *sinful* works, they produce death (Schlicht., Lün., Bisp., *etc.*), or defile like corpses (Michaelis), but because, as works of a man who stands in no right relation to the living God, they can neither express nor give life. [Perhaps, considering the character of the readers, these again may be the dead works of the Jewish law.—K.].

VER. 2. **Of the doctrine of baptisms**, *etc.*—Beng., Michael., Winer, De Wette make διδαχῆς dependent on βαπτισμῶν, and refer it to those "teaching baptisms," which, by the instructions that were connected with them, were distinguished from the purely legal lustrations of the Jews. The mere order of the words does not decide the question; for, as Thol. has shown, there are not unfrequently found with the Greeks, for the sake, not merely of emphasis, but of euphony, precisely such inverted constructions as that here assumed by the majority of commentators, who make not merely βαπτισμῶν and ἐπιθέσεως χειρῶν, but also ἀναστάσεως and κρίματος dependent on διδαχῆς. And this is decidedly required by the connection. Instructions in regard to such rites and doctrines as are elementary to the Christian, and, while they are found also in Judaism, have received from Christianity a specific import and character, and these must have been clear to Hebrews converted to Christianity, must not be always needed afresh by the readers (comp. ch. ix. 10). Thus also is explained the plural βαπτισμῶν; for βαπτισμός is a comprehensive term, which at ch. ix. 10; Mark vii. 8, denotes the Jewish washing, and in JOSEPH. *Jud. Antt.* xviii. 5, 2 denotes the baptism of John, while the specifically Christian baptism is in the New Testament always called βάπτισμα. The interpreters who suppose the author to refer specially to this latter baptism, explain the plural either of outward and inward baptism (Grot., Bald., Braun, Reuss) or of the different acts of baptism (Calov), or of triple immersion (De W.), or of the threefold baptism, *fluminis, flaminis, sanguinis* (Thomas Aquinas). Some (as Bald. and Brochm.) refer *the laying on of hands* especially to ordination; the majority to the laying on of hands immediately connected with baptism, which, after the third century, was, in connection with the chrism, elevated to the independent act of confirmation. But why should we not refer the term to setting apart or dedication in general? Alike the import and the rythmical structure of this period are opposed to the view mentioned as early as Œc., that a comma is to be placed after βαπτισμῶν, διδαχῆς to be taken separately as coördinate with βαπτισμῶν, and, like this word, dependent on θεμέλιον; and that these we are to understand by the words *catechetical instruction*, which in the earliest times was frequently imparted only after baptism. And it is equally inadmissible, with Gennadius and Klee, to make even the Genitives μετανοίας and πίστεως dependent on διδαχῆς; or, with Calvin, to put in parenthesis the words βαπτισμῶν—χειρῶν. Finally, there is no reason for referring, with Est., Schlicht., and others, the ἀνάστασις exclusively to the pious, the κρίμα exclusively to the ungodly.

VER. 3. **And this let us do**, *etc.*—The demonstrative τοῦτο is referred by Grot., Limb., Seml., Storr, *etc.* (retaining the reading ποιήσομεν as Indicative future) to θεμέλιον καταβάλλειν, and they then take καί=*also*, as implying that the author will undertake this work of laying foundations so soon as God will allow him to come in person to the Hebrews. The majority, however, rightly refer it to φερώμεθα as the finite verb of the preceding sentence; yet with this difference, that according to some the author would seem to be expressing the purpose to proceed now, if permitted, to unfold the deeper meaning of the *doctrine of righteousness* (λόγον δικαιοσύνης), while, according to others, who take the ποιήσωμεν *communicatively* (*i. e.*, as embracing the author with his readers), he is exhorting them to advance to the desired Christian perfection. This latter view accords with the connection. The conditional clause (*provided that*=ἐάνπερ, *etc.*) points to the possibility of a falling away, which would absolutely exclude the progress referred to. It is not made a matter of direct statement, whether in fact such persons are found in the Church. But it lays upon each individual the duty of self-examination. This intimation is in keeping with the rebuking and warning tone of the section which is lost sight of by Abresch and De Wette.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The goal of Christian development is *perfection*. For the attainment of this goal a *striving* is required, which rests upon reliable *foundations*, and is rightly directed by the word of *sound doctrine*, and by the *supervision* and *discipline* of church fellowship.

2. That which *lies at the basis* is not the doctrine of Divine things, but a *personal* entrance on the way of salvation by turning away from dead works (that is, works which contain in themselves no life from God), and a turning in faith to the only true and living God of Revelation and Redemption. With this personal entrance on the path of salvation, commences not merely the preaching of John the Baptist and of Jesus Christ in the history of the Gospel (Mark i. 15; Matt. iii. 2; iv. 17; Acts xx. 21); but also the influence of the Word of God on the hearts of men.

3. The *living power* and reality of such a commencement is incompatible with a simple *standing still* amidst the very rudiments of Christian life and knowledge, and excludes the bare repe-

tition of those fundamental acts which inaugurate the commencement as such; but at once urges us to, and fits us for, the confirming and unfolding of the new relation to God, which that foundation has secured for us, Phil. iii. 14.

4. Repentance and faith must daily testify their existence in the life of the Christian, inasmuch as he has not yet reached the goal of perfection, but is tending toward it. They have, however, a different significance, according as they are fundamental acts *preceding and conditioning regeneration*, and according as they belong to *daily Christian Renewal*.

5. The very elementary doctrine of Christ has to do with *sacramental* rites and *eschatological* facts, and, consequently, even elementary instruction in Christianity must be complete in the articles of doctrine, and leave no gap to be filled up in the capital points. But he who would restrict himself to the rudiments, and allow himself to deal only with them, not only deprives himself of deeper insight and of richer knowledge, but also puts himself into antagonism with the legitimate and fully *authorized demand* of progressive Christian life.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Life and doctrine have in Christianity a very noteworthy reciprocal influence.—On the foundation which has been laid we must, so far as God allows it, proceed onward to perfection.—He who has not thoroughly turned himself to God will hardly get on well even with the elementary doctrine of Christ.—Confidence in the patience and goodness of God must not render us negligent in striving after perfection.—There is a neglect in the means of grace for the furtherance of the Christian life, which cannot be made good; but brings with it apostasy and Divine judgment.

STARKE:—It is a sad sign of a great decline in Christianity, that there are so few who lay a right *foundation* in their knowledge, and are *zealous* to make further progress therein.—Where God does not aid us with His grace we can accomplish nothing rightly.—They are bad Christians, or rather they are no Christians, who know not the ground of the Christian religion.

RIEGER:—The bold determination: We will go on to perfection! must still rejoice every one who has but a slight knowledge of what is entrusted to us in the Gospel.—We may often now still experience that we have not the same power over one portion of the treasures of the knowledge of God, as over another, and not the same power at one time as at another.

HAHN:—The realm of truth is very wide. We must not, therefore, stand still, but go on to perfection.

HEUBNER:—There is a distinction between Christian doctrines, not, however, in respect of importance, as essential and unessential—for no such doctrine have Jesus and the Apostles delivered to us—but as elementary or properly *foundation* doctrines, and doctrines built upon them, and of still profounder character. There is thus a distinction of order, of connection, and of comprehensibleness.

HEDINGER:—It is well for many to advance slowly in the knowledge of doctrine, that they may be all the richer in sincere and simple-minded action.

III.

For it is impossible to bring back to a state of grace those who, after experiencing the gracious power of Christianity, have fallen back from it.

CHAPTER VI. 4–8.

4 For it is impossible for [in respect to] those who were once enlightened, and have
5 tasted of the heavenly gift, and were [been] made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and
have tasted the good word of God [a precious word of God] and the powers of the
6 world to come, if they shall fall away [and have fallen away, *παραπεσόντας*] to renew
them again unto repentance, seeing they crucify [while crucifying] to themselves the
7 Son of God afresh, and put [putting] him to an open shame. For the earth [land] which
drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them
[useful herbs for those] by [for the sake of] whom it is dressed [cultivated], receiveth
8 [shareth *μεταλαμβάνει*] blessing from God; but that which beareth [but when bear-
ing] thorns and briers [thistles] [it] is rejected [reprobated, *ἀδόκιμος*] and is nigh unto
cursing, whose end is to be burned.

[Ver. 4.—τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας, *those who were once for all* (not *at one time*, or *formerly*) *illuminated.*
Ver. 5.—καλὸν γευσαμένους θεοῦ ῥῆμα, *tasted an excellent or precious utterance of God.*

Ver. 6.—καὶ παραπεσόντας, *and fell aside* or *fell away;* παρά, nearly as ch. ii. 1—πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν, *to renew back again*, or *over again*, πάλιν, not pleonastic (as Grot.) but indicates a *second* renewing, which is not necessarily nor ordinarily implied in ἀνακαινίζειν, but simply *renewing*. (Alf. and Moll.,)—εἰς μετ. *into repentance* with Eng. Ver. Moll, *etc.*,—ἀνασταυροῦντας, *while they are renailing to the cross, crucifying afresh:* such the force of the ἀνά and the present Participle.

Ver. 7.—Γῆ ἡ πιοῦσα, *Earth* or *Land which drank* (Aor. Part.):—ἐπ' αὐτῆς *upon it* pregnant Gen. with verb of motion *coming on and remaining on.*—τίκτουσα, *and is bearing*, apparently connected back by καί so as to be coördinated with πιοῦσα=*which drank and is producing*. We might expect τίκτουσα μέν—ἐκφέρουσα δέ (Alf.) which would be more idiomatic and elegant. Observe the *life* implied in πιοῦσα, τίκτουσα, μεταλαμβάνει,—δι' οὓς, *for the sake of whom*, not as Eng. Ver. *by whom*—μεταλαμβάνει, *shareth in, participateth*. Rec. Ver. *receiveth*, misses the special force of the word (as if it were δέχεται, λαμβάνει).

Ver. 8.—ἐκφέρουσα δέ, *but while bringing forth*, joined to its noun γῆ *predicatively*, while τίκτουσα with ἡ is united to it *attributively*.—τριβόλους rendered Matt. vii. 16: Gen. iii. 18, *thistles*. So Moll: *Disteln*.—ἀδόκιμος again a term of life, *reprobated*. See Rom. i. 23; Heb. xii. 17, ἀπεδοκιμάσθη, *was reprobated, discarded*.—K].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 4. **For it is impossible,** *etc.*—The γάρ refers neither to the conditional clause immediately preceding [Abresch], nor to the clause μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενο, ver. 1 (De Wette after the earlier interpp.), nor to both together (Schlicht.); but to the leading exhortation of ver. 3, τοῦτο ποιήσωμεν, which looks back to the exhortation (ver. 1) to strive after perfection. To weaken down the ἀδύνατον into *perdifficile* (Jerome, Erasm., Zwingle, *etc.*) under the plea of a rhetorical exaggeration, is purely arbitrary. Neither are we to supply παρ' ἀνθρώποις according to Matth. xix. 26 (Ambrose, Limb., Beng., Heubn., *etc.*). The object of the author is precisely this: to set before the eyes of the readers the whole magnitude of the danger, and the fearful import and gravity of the crisis to which they have come.

Once enlightened.—The patristic interpreters aimed chiefly to oppose the Montanists and Novatians, who sought by this passage to justify their refusal to readmit to the Church those who had backslidden. These patristic expositors, and after them Thom. Aquinas, Este, Corn. a Lapide, Michael., Ernesti, *etc.*, take φωτίζειν in the sense in which it is employed by Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 62, 65), *viz.*, of *baptism*. They sought, then, to show that the author is not speaking here of regeneration in the narrower sense, but of reception into the Christian community by means of baptism; and that thus only the repetition of baptism upon the readmission of those who had deeply fallen, is declared inadmissible. But the context, and the use of the word, (ch. x. 32), show that the word here denotes spiritual enlightenment effected through the preaching of the Gospel (comp. John i. 9; Eph. iii. 9; Ps. xxxvi. 10). The ἅπαξ stands in contrast with πάλιν, ver. 6. Men pass the turning point from darkness to light (Eph. v. 14) only once; the change can never occur again (Del.).

Have tasted the heavenly gift.—By this heavenly gift many interpreters, with Primas., understand the Lord's Supper; others, with Chrys., justifying grace, or forgiveness of sin; some, with Grotius, the peace of mind, which it engenders; many, with Calmet, the Holy Spirit, or with Seb. Schmidt, and Bengel, the person of Jesus Christ. Abresch and Bleek understand the above-mentioned illumination or the heavenly light which produces this illumination; Morus and others, the Christian religion or the Gospel. Tholuck, however, and the more recent interpreters, declare themselves, with good reason against every special interpretation, pointing to 2 Cor. x. 15, where salvation in Christ is called "the unspeakable gift" of grace, and laying stress, partly on the close connection of this clause with the preceding, made by the particle τε, and partly on the emphatic position of γευσαμένους at the beginning of the clause.

The connection and object of the passage require that we take this latter word according to rabbinical usage, just as at ch. ii. 9, in the sense of practical experience, by actual personal appropriation and enjoyment. The construction with the Gen. (instead of the Accus. as at ver. 5) does not warrant the interpretation made in the interests of Calvinism, of a mere tasting with the tip of the tongue. The former construction is Greek—the latter Hellenistic. Perhaps it may also be said that the choice of the former construction was dictated by the idea of an enjoyment out of the fulness of those heavenly riches of grace which were designed for, and proffered to, the collective body, while the second construction points to the idea "that the good word of God has been, as it were, the daily bread of the persons whom the language describes" (Del.).

Ver. 5. **The precious word of God, and the powers of the world to come.**—Many interpreters regard, with Chrys. and Primas., the first expression merely as a description of the Gospel generally; Calvin and Braun regard it at least as placed in contrast with the judicial rigor of the Mosaic law. The majority, however, referring to Josh. xxi. 43; Zech. i. 13, and similar passages find in it a special reference to the divine promises of a blessed future, and to peaceful rest in the Land of Promise. The *world to come* (αἰὼν μέλλων) stands in the same sense as ch. ii. 5, μέλλουσα οἰκουμένη, and the "powers" (δυνάμεις) of that world are those mentioned chap. ii. 4. And thus too narrow is the reference, on the one hand, to the foretaste of future glory (Primas., Böhme, *etc.*), and, on the other, to the miraculous acts of the Apostles that have been witnessed by believers, or experienced in their own persons (Wittich, Braun, *etc.*).

Ver. 6. **And have fallen away.**—The author has not in mind particular gross or conscious sins, as Luther erroneously supposed, and hence took offence at the passage. He has rather in view apostasy from the recognized and experienced *truth of salvation*, as a sin closely allied to the sin against the Holy Ghost. The Aor. particip. points to the fact that this breaking off from all fellowship with Christ is a single and once for all accomplished act; while the following Present Participles express the condition which follows upon this falling away, cha-

racterizing its state alike of utter hopelessness and self-condemnation. [As to the question of the moral condition of the persons here described, I shall add but little. The question had probably hardly presented itself at this time as a distinct point of *Christian doctrine*, whether a regenerated person could fall away. One thing was certain, *viz.*, that the Christian profession and the actual Christian character of the members of the church did not take them out of the category of *free moral agents*, who stood *personally responsible* for their perseverance and steadfastness in their Christian profession, and who were, therefore, to be appealed to by every consideration which could address itself to persons who, under God, held their destiny in their own keeping. It was also equally certain that their salvation depended on their perseverance; that he, and he only, who *held out to the end*, would be saved, and this was equally true whether we adopt the supposition that they actually could apostatize from a state of grace, or whether their apostasy only proved that they had never been in a regenerated state. In either case the mode of spiritual treatment was the same. None could look behind the curtain into the volume of the divine decrees; and the only practical test of the reality of one's Christianity, and the only assurance of his salvation, was his *holding on to the end*. As a doctrinal question, therefore, it was totally unnecessary that it should be raised and decided. Meantime another thing was equally certain, because lying in the very nature of the case. If a person who had partaken of the grace of Christ, and been born again by the power of the Holy Spirit, and sanctified by the blood of Jesus, *did* fall away, and turn his back completely on all these gracious agencies, and these *highest and final* means of salvation, his case was hopeless. There was no more sacrifice for sin. He had exhausted all the provisions of Divine love and compassion, and henceforth nothing remained to him but a fearful looking for of inevitable judgment. If, then, this and like passages in Hebrews *do* teach the possibility of falling from grace, they teach, in like manner, the impossibility of restoration to it. The saint who has once apostatized, *has apostatized forever*. Meantime, the case is only put hypothetically. There is not, so far as I am aware, a distinct declaration that such a falling away does actually occur; but only a declaration, if it should occur, what in the nature of the case must be the inevitable consequence. And I cannot forbear adding, that in my judgment, the tenor of many passages of the New Testament is decidedly against the *actual possibility* of such apostasy, and that the admission of the doctrine would revolutionize the whole orthodox conception of the New Testament system of salvation.—K.].

To renew them again unto repentance.—The position of πάλιν forbids our connecting it with παραπεσόντας (Heinr. *etc.*); nor need we with Grot. regard it as pleonastic in its connection with ἀνακαινίζειν. For ἀνά in composition does not necessarily denote a return into a previous state, but may regard the action as *commencing* (with the kindred meaning of *springing up*). Thus ἀνακαινίζειν, ἀνακαινοῦν, particularly may denote the inauguration of a new state of things, and, referring to man's transfer from his old state, imply his being brought *up back* into a higher life, Rom. xii. 2; 2 Cor. iv. 16; Col. iii. 10. *Repentance* (μετάνοια) appears here not as the *means* (Chrys., Corn. a Lapide, *etc.*), but as the *result* and state of renewal. Ἀνακαινίζειν is properly *to be renewing, to endeavor to renew*. Some, therefore, (as Ambrose, Beng., Heubner, *etc.*), would find in the *active* voice ground for restricting the statement to the *efforts of men*, for the conversion of others, leaving their renewal still among the things *which are possible with God* (Matt. xix. 26). But the fact that alike here vv. 7, 8, and subsequently ch. x. 26 ff. special emphasis is laid on the judicial and retributive judgment *of God*, forbids such a limitation. Thus, undoubtedly, the active form is neither to be confounded with the Pass. (Vulg., Calv., *etc.*), nor to be taken reflexively=*to renew oneself* (Orig., Erasm., Lapide, *etc*). But the active is explained from a reference to the employment in the church of the ordinary means of grace.

While crucifying for themselves the Son of God afresh.—With the Greeks ἀνασταυροῦν means only *to nail to the cross;* but even the Greek expositors find here expressed in ἀνά, the natural and appropriate idea of *repetition*. The ἑαυτοῖς is by many expositors erroneously rendered (with Œc. and Calv.), *so far as in them lies;* and by Heinrichs *each for himself*. Schultz takes it as Dat. of the instrument=*by themselves*. More natural would be the *Dat. loc.* (Beng., Abresch, Thol.), according to which the apostates place themselves on the same platform and level with the unbelieving Jews; but better than either, it may be taken as the *Dat. commodi;* not, however, in the sense of Klee, and Stengel, *viz.*, for their own satisfaction and for the gratification of their hardened heart, but rather as the *Dat. incommodi*, *viz.*, for their own destruction, (Vatabl., Bl., Lün., Del). [With Alf. I regard this last meaning of "in perniciem" as too strong, and as carrying that which lies *in the nature and necessities of the case*, into the grammatical relation of the word. It is I think simply the *Dat. commodi*—expressing that which is done *for*, *with reference to themselves*, and the question of the consequences, whether destruction or otherwise, is not to be found in the relation itself. Wordsworth explains artificially crucifying "not to him, for he is impassable; but to themselves and to their own perdition."—K].

VER. 7.—**For the sake of whom.**—Δι' οὓς is erroneously referred by the Vulg., Erasm., Luth., Calv., *etc.*, to those who cultivate the land [so our Eng. Ver.]. It in fact refers to the *possessors*, to whose benefit the cultivating is to inure. We have rendered τὸν ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἐρχόμενον by the perfect, *has come upon it;* because ἐπί with the Gen. used with verbs of *motion*, includes also the subsequent *remaining* in that state.—(WIN. *Gr.* 6 *Ed. p.* 336).

VER. 8.—**Whose end is for burning.**—The relation of the words ἧς τὸ τέλος εἰς καῦσιν to the immediately preceding κατάρας, *curse*, [*viz.*, the end of which curse] is that which most immediately forces itself upon the reader, Camerar., Abr., Heinr., Bl.), yet the majority of expositors, since Chrys. have referred the phrase back to

the main subject of the clause, making it declare not the end of the *curse*, but the end of the *land* (γῆς)—a construction which is certainly possible. At all events the allusion is undoubtedly to a consuming with brimstone and salt (Deut. xxix. 22; Is. xxxiv. 9) by which the land is condemned to utter sterility and uselessness. Some, in advocacy of the ἀποκατάστασις, have endeavored to draw from it the opposite doctrine, and find in the passage such a burning up of weeds and noxious vegetation as should cleanse the ground and restore its fertility (so Schlicht. *etc.*); but no explanation could be more totally alien from the context.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

We may imagine a man's reaching a state of abandonment and moral corruption from which *no deliverance* is possible, and which draws after itself inevitably *eternal damnation*. All endeavors to banish this thought from our passage do violence to the words, and spring from theoretical prejudices against the truth which is here advanced, and which also receives ch. x. 26 ff. a more full elucidation. It is not, however, said that this condition has in the case of any one already taken place. The reader is only warned, but this in the most startling manner, against sinking into this state as one that threatens him.

2. This condition does not precede regeneration, but necessarily presupposes it; yet not in the broader sense in which regeneration denotes the forgiveness of sins and a transfer into the condition of the children of God, but in *the narrower sense* which at the same time includes *subsequentem renovationem* (*Form. Concord.* III. 19; JOHN GERHARD, *Loc. Theol.*, tom. VIII).

3. The *possibility* of such an inexcusable and consciously guilty falling off from Christ, and which involves a complete falling away from the gracious state, is presupposed by the Lord Jesus Himself, not indeed Luke xxii. 31 ff., yet certainly John xv. 1 ff. and the sin of denial mentioned Math. x. 33; Luke xii. 9, threatened with the most fearful consequences, presumes a like condition in one who had previously professed discipleship. Moreover, John recognizes *a sin unto death* (ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον) 1 John v. 16, which even admits no further intercession. There is thus no contradiction in our epistle to the elsewhere recognized doctrine of the Gospel, and the Calvinistic theory of the identity of the *renatus* and the *electus* appears in this respect also as unscriptural. Compare besides on this point Rom. xi. 21; 1 Cor. x. 1–13; Gal. v. 4; 1 Tim. i. 19, iv. 1, vi. 10, 21; 2 Pet. ii. 20; Rev. iii. 16.

4. The entire identification of the apostasy here named with *the sin against the Holy Ghost* (in regard to which compare the treatises of MAGN FR. ROOS, 1771, and of PHIL. SCHAFF, 1841; MÜLLER'S *Doctrine of Sin*, 4 ed., 1860; and ALEX. VON ŒTTINGER, *de pecato in Spir. S. qua cum eschatologia Christiana contineatur ratione*, 1856), becomes questionable from the fact that the latter may be committed even by those who from the very commencement have hardened themselves against the influences of the Holy Spirit, and have thus passed on to obduracy and blasphemy, Matt. xii. 31 ff.; Mark iii. 28 ff.; Luke xii. 10. The majority of interpreters, therefore, since Bleek regard the sin against the Holy Ghost as the *broader and more comprehensive*. Comp. RIEHM, II., 764 ff., 819 ff.

5. Neither does this statement of our author stand in contradiction with the doctrine of the *power of Divine grace*, or of the *full authority of the Church* to forgive all sins. For the grace of God operates neither magically nor violently, and the forgiveness of sins has for its condition repentance and faith. But the very characteristic of this sin of apostasy consists in the fact of rejecting the means of grace, which had been previously employed and experienced as fraught with saving power, and this in a radical hostility to their truth and saving efficacy; and thus rendering all their influence *objectively* impossible. There is a continued re-crucifying of the Son of God, by which He becomes exposed anew to the derision of the world.

6. The designation of this sin as *apostasy* is as far from excluding the fact of its *gradual* development in a soul, as the description of it as *sinning wilfully*, (ἑκουσίως ἁμαρτάνων, ch. x. 26) is from denying the fact of the *deceptive* working of sin, ch. iii. 13. "It is the fruit of an entire series of individual, wilful, and unrepented sins; the final result of a whole series of misdeeds, and of violent repressions of the impulses of the Holy Spirit," (Riehm). All the more necessary then are the warnings and exhortations of our epistle for those who have not yet destroyed within themselves a susceptibility to the influences of the Spirit of God, and who have not as yet made themselves incapable of faith or of repentance.

7. But in the destruction in man of the susceptibility of moral and religious renovation, there is accomplished not merely a *law of psychological development*, but at the same time a *Divine, punitive judgment* which has its ground in a *condemning sentence* of God. This sentence proves itself ultimately valid and decisive, not indeed in accordance with any eternal decree, but *judicially*, after God has proved the apostates to be utterly reprobate. But the entire carrying through of this judgment is still in the future. By this let none be deceived. "Yet we must guard ourselves alike against making the apostolic warning a source of torture and despair, and a pillow of fleshly security" (Del.). Comp. SPENER, *Theol. Reflections, IV.* 634; *Latest Theol. Reflections, II.* 398; PALMER, *Pastoral Theology* (1860); 2d ed., 1863; VALENTI, *Pastoral Healing*, 2 parts, 1832, "*On Spiritual Conflicts.*"

8. "He who through moral unfaithfulness has fallen into the illusion that he has been deceived by *objective truth*, can no longer prove indifferent toward this, since he is unable entirely to deny it. It has, as truth, maintained itself in his inner being; there remains, therefore, within him, a sting of conscience, which urges him to self-justification, and with this to inward and outward struggles, whether in argument or in wanton railing against that truth which will no longer leave the sinner, whom it once claimed as its possession. If now we take into consideration that ever growing, ever deepening power of evil, which is expressed in the saying: "In the first

step ye are free; at the second, ye are slaves," then assuredly we can recognize as possible, within the sphere of such a conscious though unconfessed self-deception, a degree of obduracy in which conversion is impossible" (THOLUCK).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The lapse from a state of grace: *a.* in its origin; *b.* in its characteristics; *c.* in its consequences.—He who has fallen from grace is worse than he who has never attained to it.—That which was written for our warning, and that which takes place for our example, whether in nature or in history, we should never allow to minister to our perverseness.—The susceptibility to the repeated influences of grace.—The way to Heaven is much easier and pleasanter than the way to Hell; those who walk in it have already, in the enjoyment of the blessings of salvation, a foretaste of heavenly powers and delights.

STARKE:—The impossibility of the conversion of a fallen sinner, consists not in a deficiency of the grace of God, or of the merit of Christ, or of the influence of the Holy Spirit; but in the conduct and character of the sinner who wilfully rejects Christ, and the economy of salvation.—The happy, gracious state of believers, is a glorious token of the Divine origin, truth, and excellency of the Christian religion.—All backslidings are not equally dangerous, but none is without danger.—The grace of God visits all men, but with a great difference in spiritual productiveness, according to the quality and moral condition of the heart.—We need even after conversion, perpetual accessions of the grace of God, and repeated anointings of the Divine Spirit; after these must we yearn, and eagerly receive them, like a well prepared field.—For us also it may doubtless be said: "The plough or the curse."

RIEGER:—He who labors in accordance with the Divine appointment, receives what he must ascribe not to his labor, but manifestly to the blessing of God.—Hidden and secret as may be the workings of grace, we could always track them out, if we would give to them the same heed that we apply to our domestic and worldly affairs.

HEUBNER:—The condition of men is all the more dangerous, their reformation all the more difficult, by how much the farther they have previously been, by how much the higher they have arisen.—The gifts of grace already obtained, impose a solemn obligation; and he who has already received the Spirit, has a heavy responsibility.—The falling away of advanced Christians is an insult offered to Christianity and to Christ Himself; is a declaration that Christ was justly crucified.—The heart that receives in vain the labor employed upon it, and bears no fruit, is rejected of God.—Moral desolation and reprobation are the heaviest punishments and judgments of God.

STEIN:—Sinners are frequently visited by Divine grace. If they produce the righteous fruits of repentance, then they may expect anew proofs of the Divine favor; while in the opposite case, they may expect no long forbearance, and least of all, when they apostatize, may they look for any new exercise of compassion.

FRICKE:—A fearful sin, and a frightful judgment.

HEDINGER:—The devil in his heart, death in his bosom, hell beneath his feet, and a curse on his posterity.

IV.

But the readers are still in a condition which, by the grace of God, renders possible the attainment of the goal, for which they are earnestly to strive.

CHAPTER VI. 9–12.

9 But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany sal-
10 vation, though we thus speak. For God *is* not unrighteous to forget your work and
labor of [*om.* labor of][1] love, which ye have [*om.* have] shewed toward his name, in
that ye have [*om.* have] ministered to the saints, and do minister [are ministering].
11 And [But] we desire that every one of you do shew the same diligence to [in respect
12 to] the full assurance of hope unto the end: That ye be [become=prove yourselves]
not slothful, but followers [imitators] of them, who through faith and patience [long-
suffering] inherit the promises.

[1] Ver. 10.—The words τοῦ κόπου before τῆς ἀγάπης, noted by Beza, Mill, Bengel, and others, as spurious, have, since Griesbach, been properly cancelled as a gloss from 1 Thess. i. 3.

[Ver. 9.—τὰ κρείσσονα καὶ ἐχ., *the things which are better, and are connected with salvation.* The article not repeated.—εἰ καί, *if also*, or *even=although.*

Ver. 11.—ἐπιθυμοῦμεν δέ, *But* (better than *and* here as adversative) we desire.—τὴν αὐτὴν σπουδήν, *the same zeal*, πρός, *with reference to, in respect to*, Eng. ver. inadequately simply *to*, and mars the sense by putting a comma after *diligence.*

Ver. 12.—ἵνα μὴ γένησθε, *that ye may not become*, or *prove yourselves*—μιμηταί, *imitators.*—μακροθυμία, *long-suffering.*—K.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 9. **But we are persuaded better things**, *etc.*—The epithet ἀγαπητοί (beloved), so frequent with Paul, is found in our epistle only in this place, where the author, by the verb πεπείσμεθα, emphatically expresses his conviction that the terrible results which he has depicted will not be realized in the case of his readers. Τὰ κρείσσονα is referred by some to a *better destiny*, by others to a *better condition*. The former, then, regard ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας chiefly as a periphrasis for σωτηρία itself; while the latter refer this expression to that which *tends* to salvation. More exactly ἐχόμενόν τινος denotes that which stands connected with an object (whether outwardly or inwardly, locally or temporally), and belongs to it. The words are thus to be taken in a comprehensive sense, and stand parallel to the κατάρας ἐγγύς.

VER. 10. **For God is not unrighteous**, *etc.*—This verse contains the ground on which the author bases his persuasion. That ground is not properly the *judicial and retributive justice* of God, nor the anticipation of the *reward* which God, according to the Romish doctrine *de merito condigno*, might bestow on such good works as man is enabled to perform by the aid of Divine grace. It is rather that consistency and uniformity in God's dealings, inseparable from His fidelity (1 John, i. 9), which would render it seemingly impossible for Him to withdraw His gracious assistance from those who in their life, walk, and conduct display the truth and power of their faith, and the genuineness and depth of their conversion. Τὸ ἔργον denotes the moral conduct as a whole (1 Thess. i. 3, Gal. vi. 4), in distinction from τὰ ἔργα, which denotes its manifold attestations (comp. Rom. ii. 6 with ii. 15). Εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Chrysostom regards as indicating purpose = *for the glorifying of His name*, so that it might also be taken = διὰ τὸ ὄνομα, *for the sake of the name of God*. The majority, however, with Theophyl., take it as the object of τῆς ἀγάπης = *love toward His name*. The Aor. Inf. ἐπιλαθέσθαι expresses neither past time (Seb. Schmidt) nor future (Bisp.); but the mere *action of the verb*, without reference to the relation of time [thus not *to have forgotten*, nor *to be going to forget*, but simply *to forget*]. (Kühn., II. § 445, 2).

To the saints.—KÖSTLIN (*Tüb. Theol. Jahrb.*, 1854, Heft. 3, p. 378) maintains, after Credner, that the expression τοῖς ἁγίοις indicates that the "Hebrews," to whom our epistle is directed, must be regarded as a non-Palestinian church which had rendered succor to the Christians of Palestine. But the words τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, which the apostle deemed it necessary to add, Rom. xv. 26, to τῶν ἁγίων, refutes his hypothesis, based on the opinion that the Christians of Palestine, and particularly those of Jerusalem, were regarded as ἅγιοι κατ' ἐξοχήν (saints *par excellence*), and passages like Rom. xvi. 2, 1 Cor. vi. 1, 2, in connection with the salutations in the epistles of Paul, show the groundlessness of the assumption that none other than the original Church could have been designated simply as οἱ ἅγιοι. Moreover, Del. calls attention to the fact that this manifestation of love may very well have taken place within the limits of the readers' own country, ch. x. 34, xiii. 24; Acts iv. 32, xi. 29.

VER. 11. **The same zeal.**—The author does not mean to say that all the members of the Church have a like loving zeal, nor that they must still not fail to evince the same loving zeal which they have hitherto manifested (Chrys., Grot., etc.), but rather that the like zeal which they have manifested in respect to love they must in future evince in regard to the πληροφορία of Christian hope (so the majority since Beng.). The want of a "full assurance of faith" or of an assured conviction of the truth of the specifically Christian hope, is precisely the reason of the doubtful and unstable condition of the readers, who stand in peril of a defection from Christianity.

VER. 12. **That ye do not prove sluggish**, *etc.*—Here the author is speaking of growth in Christian hope, in a believing and assured hope; at ch. v. 11, on the contrary, he speaks of a like growth in the understanding of Christian truth. There is thus no contradiction in his using here γένησθε, *may* (*not*) become, and there γεγόνατε, *have become;* and we need not, with Heinrichs, instead of νωθροί conjecture according to ch. xii. 8 νόθοι. [I doubt much if the author's consistency requires precisely such a defence, substantially that of Lün., viz., that in the former case the author speaks of "sluggishness of Christian hearing, here of Christian practice." It is scarcely possible that the hearers had fallen so low in spiritual understanding and brought themselves to the verge of apostasy without having become already liable to the charge of sluggishness in Christian practice. But in addressing a Christian body the author is not necessarily confined to a stereotyped style of expression. He may at one time charge them with actual backsliding, and at another, in a strain of tender exhortation, guard them against the danger of it, especially as what was true of some might not be true of all, and even of some only in a degree.—K.]. The inheriting the promises (κληρονομεῖν τὰς ἐπαγγελίας) is designated as a consequence of faith (πίστις) and long-suffering (μακροθυμία). It can thus not refer to receiving the *words* of promise (Bl.), but to the obtaining of its *substance*. The Pres. Part. τῶν κληρονομούντων *who are inheriting*, implies a continuous and abiding act, so that the reference can scarcely be exclusively to the Patriarchs (Bl., De W., Thol., Bisp., etc.). It is not until the following verse that the sentiment, here stated in general terms, is illustrated for the readers by the concrete example of Abraham.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

The personal conviction that the members of the Church have their desires still fixed on things which lie within the sphere of salvation, and have in them their supreme interest, does not release the teacher from the duty of emphatically warning against unfaithfulness and apostasy; from laying open truthfully its causes and consequences, and so depicting the magnitude and imminence of the danger as to penetrate and

affect the conscience. But, on the other hand, also, even in the case of those who hold a questionable position in the Church, he is not to forget that God himself has pleasure in remembering that which deserves recognition, and will call it forth and render it productive of blessing. Such means of influence are least of all to be overlooked in the case of those who are in conditions of assault and peril; and the manifestation of personal sympathy along with an affectionate recognition of the attestations and works of Christian feeling and conduct which they have displayed are entirely in place after they have been previously rebuked from the Word of God, and been convinced of their wrong.

2. There is found not unfrequently a zealous and enduring *manifestation of love* not merely in general toward those who are in need, but in particular toward their oppressed and afflicted companions in faith, shown by those Christians who are partly insecure and weak in their recognition of Christian truth; partly wavering and feeble in the assurance of their Christian hope; partly neglectful and indolent in their striving specifically after a full assurance of faith. We are in this matter to insist that the one be done without the neglect of the other; and we are carefully to avail ourselves of the encouragement which lies in the fact that living service toward the members of the Church of Jesus Christ is regarded by God as a *testifying of their love toward His own nature,* Matth. xxv. 31 ff.

3. From the holy nature of God there follows such a system of divine action as to insure that no attestation of love to Him shall remain unrewarded, but rather shall *bring a blessing in return* in our spiritual advancement. Under this state of the case, we may regard such a blessing also under the point of view of *righteousness* and of *reward,* as in fact the Scripture speaks even of a *recompensing* of the good. But we are not warranted in demanding this recompense on the basis of our claim to a reward for services rendered, nor in basing on it any alleged title to salvation; for every performance on the part of man of that which is acceptable to God, and which He has commanded, is only rendering the *service which is due* (Luke xvii. 10). BERNH. WEISS, in his stirring *Treatise on Christ's Doctrine of Reward* (*Deutsche Zeitsch. für christl. Wiss. und christl. Leben,* 1853, *Nr.* 40–42), very significantly styles the relation of reward between God and man "an *economical* one, a matter of economy or arrangement, instituted by God for the realizing of His plan of salvation."

4. The moral condition of the world and the state of the Christian Church may greatly contribute to the apparent impossibility of reaching the goal of perfection and of attaining the promised inheritance, or may at least render their attainment so difficult that many Christians become sluggish and grow cold in that zeal and fervor of faith which has approved itself in their previous walk, and which is still evinced in other spheres of action. In this case the example of those who by faith and enduring patience have reached the goal may prove greatly stimulating.

5. But it belongs essentially to the influence of examples that they be not merely held up to view, contemplated, and admired, but that they be imitated; and in this lies the difficulty and consequent rareness of genuine disciples' life. For faith has to do with the invisible, heavenly, and future, which it is to apprehend and hold fast as the most absolutely certain and reliable of all things; and long-suffering patience, "without falling into despondency and despair, must await with cheerfulness and with equable, abiding courage, the yet lingering salvation."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Love must not cease to warn, to serve, and to hope.—We are not the first on the way to perfection; let us look well to it that we do not remain behind among the last.—Where there are still points of character that link us to salvation, God has long since had them in mind, and would fain make use of them.—Love seeks no reward; yet it finds it.—Services rendered to our companions in the faith are a work of faith with which God is well pleased, and a labor of love which God will reward.—The love that labors and sacrifices for the good of our neighbor is also a service rendered to God, but this only in connection with love to the name of God and with the faith of the saints.—How the striving after the anticipated inheritance of the promise is hindered in the world, but in the Church of God is at once demanded and promoted.

STARKE: We must hope good of every one, and not easily despair of the salvation of any; for God is wont to go forth even "about the eleventh hour."—Rebuke thy neighbor, if there is great need, at the right time and in the right place, with compassion, without too severe words, and without the spirit of detraction. Perchance thou gainest him.—A believing Christian may be indeed certain of his own felicity, but still not without a holy solicitude for his perseverance and steadfastness in what is good.—God rewards the good works which He demands of us from grace.—It is not merely in heaven that the saints are to be sought and found: they are to prove themselves saints on earth.—Our strengthening and support come indeed from the Lord; but we must industriously employ the means which strengthen and keep us unto eternal life.—Nothing so much favors backsliding as negligence and sloth.—Faith and Christian patience belong together; the former produces the latter, and the latter is a genuine test of faith.—Blessed is he who fails not of the eternal inheritance: he may have much, little, or nothing of temporal things: to have God is to have all.

RIEGER: Though we may have good hope in regard to the majority, we should still give zealous attention to individuals, Acts xx. 31.—One may frequently be more ready to suffer for a good cause, and to perish with it, than to persevere in the hope of a victorious issue. Hence exhortation to equal diligence in hope is very needful; for unless hope were renewed the sparks of love would be entirely extinguished.—To mark the footsteps of those that have preceded us is on the race-course of faith a great advantage.—Faith first apprehends and seizes the promise; patience and long-suffering await it to the end.

HEUBNER: The picture of the wretchedness and ruin of apostates tends strongly to arouse the faithful and to guard them against security and remissness.—The thought of Divine aid should spur on and arouse us also to diligence, zeal, and perseverance.—So far from faith tending to check activity, it rather preserves us against sloth and gives us power for action.

V.

The example of Abraham shows that perseverance in faith leads to the attainment of the promised blessing, which is pledged by the oath of God.

CHAPTER VI. 13–15.

13 For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater,
14 he sware by himself, saying, Surely[1] blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I
15 will multiply thee. And so, after he had patiently endured [patiently enduring], he
obtained the promise.

[1] Ver. 14.—Instead of ἦ μήν we should read, with Cod. Sin., A. B. D. E, 17, 23, εἰ μήν. This is the customary form with the LXX., springing from the blending of the classical ἦ μήν with the Hellenistic εἰ μή, which C. and J**. read here, and which imitates the Hebrew אִם לֹא.

[Ver. 13.—Ἐπαγγειλάμενος Moll renders "*after* making promise," thus making the promise precede the oath in time, the promise being given at various times, as Gen. xii. 7, xvii. 5, xviii. 18, while it is not until Gen. xxii. 16–18 that the oath is given. So, previously, De Wette and Lünemann. Delitzsch and Alford, however, more correctly, I think, make the ἐπαγγειλ. express an act contemporaneous with the ὤμοσεν, viz., God, *when He promised, swore*, and refer both to Gen. xxii. The Eng. ver. is, I think, correct.

Ver. 15.—Καὶ οὕτως, *and thus*, *i. e.* under these conditions,—μακροθυμήσας ἐπέτυχεν, *by patiently enduring he obtained*=he patiently endured and obtained: not *having patiently endured, he obtained*.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 13. **For to Abraham**—"*Exemplum Abrahæ adducitur, non quia unicum sit, sed quia præ aliis illustre.*" (CALV.).

God in making promise, *etc.*—Lünem. rightly follows De Wette in taking ἐπαγγειλάμενος, as in time *preceding* the ὤμοσεν, and refers it to the promises which had been already given to Abraham, Gen. xii. 7; xvii. 5; xviii. 18, which finally, at Gen. xxii. 16–18, were not merely repeated and confirmed by an oath, but at the same time had an *incipient* fulfilment. Del. refers the language only to the last named passage, in which, after the offering of Isaac, promise and oath are united. The Aor. Part. would then express an act *contemporaneous* with the finite verb. [God promising swore=he promised and swore.] But Abraham had previously nothing upon which he could rely but the *promise*. This was now, after he had long waited for the promised Son, and had then consented to the sacrifice of Him, been not merely renewed to him, but by the Divine oath attested as thoroughly to be relied on; yet at the same time alike by the oath itself, and by its own intrinsic nature, the promise was marked as one which could have only a *gradual* realization, and that completely only in the distant future. For this reason Abraham was even to the last remitted to the μακροθυμία, which was conditioned upon his *faith*, and in this relation stands as an individual and concrete example of the general truth uttered in the preceding verse, and as an instructive and stimulating pattern for his readers; precisely as also at ch. xi. 13, 29, they are reminded that the Patriarchs did not live to see the fulfilment of the promise, but only saluted it from afar.

VER. 15. **And thus patiently enduring, he obtained the promise.**—The οὕτως, *thus*, is to be constructed with ἐπέτυχεν (Bl., De W., Lün., Alf.), not with μακροθυμήσας (Stein, Thol., Bisp., Hofm.), nor to the two combined (Del.); but points back to the just previously mentioned pledge of the Divine oath confirming the Divine promise. It thus presents the *objective* historical condition under which Abraham obtained the promise, while μακροθυμήσας indicates his *subjective* condition; *i. e.*, he, under the condition of having waited long and patiently since the promise of God was first made (Gen. xv.), now (Gen. xxii.) received the oath which guaranteed the fulfilment of the promise. The added clause thus involves a slight progress in the discourse (even if we make τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, refer only to the *word* of promise), inasmuch as at all events it holds up to the view of the readers, as strongly brought out in the typical history of Abraham, that μακροθυμία which is so essentially involved in the preceding exhortation. If we seek a still further advance, we shall scarcely find it in the *verb* (as does OTTO,

who, p. 108, interprets the ἐπέτυχε as an *actual taking possession*, or as an *attainment*—no longer dependent on the tried and approved fidelity of the subject—of the irrevocably pledged promise); nor in the fact that ἐπαγγελία is to be interpreted specially of the *Messianic salvation* (Bleek); but only by explaining the ἐπαγγελία of the *subject matter* of the promise, whose *attainment* (ἐπέτυχε) commences with the receiving back of Isaac (ch. xi. 17, 19), yet is not to be restricted (as by De W., Lün.) to that which Abraham *even on earth* lived to see of the multiplication of his posterity. The promise (which here substitutes the abbreviated and *concentrated* form πληθυνῶ σέ, for the fuller expression of the LXX., πληθυνῶ τὸ σπέρμα σου) embraces in its fulfilment a blessing bestowed on Abraham, extending down through time and onward into eternity.

[The precise relations and import of the passage just explained, are matter of some difficulty, and of a good deal of diversity of opinion. *Grammatically* the difficulty lies in determining whether the Aor. Participles ἐπαγγειλάμενος (ver. 13) and μακροθυμήσας (ver. 15) are, either or both of them, to be construed as expressing an action *anterior to*, or *contemporaneous with* the principal verb—either of which construction is equally consistent with the use of the Aorist. In the former case we should render: "*after giving* promise to Abraham, God swore," *etc.;* and "and thus, *after having waited patiently*, he obtained," *etc.* In the latter case we should render thus: "*upon giving* promise or when *he gave* promise—God swore;" and "suffering long he obtained"= "he waited patiently and obtained," or, "*by* waiting patiently he obtained." In the former case the giving of the promise *precedes* the swearing of the oath, and the promise (ἐπαγγειλάμ. must be supposed to refer to Gen. xii. 7; xv. 4, 5, *etc.;* xvii. 5; xviii. 18, as preceding the oath given Gen. xxii., at the time of the offering of Isaac. In this case also the μακροθυμήσας, *having waited patiently*, will refer to Abraham's patient waiting during the time which elapsed between the promise of the birth of his son, and its fulfilment, and also perhaps to his cheerful submission to the command to offer up his son in sacrifice. So the passage is taken substantially by De Wette, Lünemann, and Moll; and in this case the "*obtaining* the promise" after his long waiting, took place in part in his receiving his son back from the grave, while in part this only prefigures and commences its fulfilment, which runs on into the indefinite and endless future. In the other construction—which makes the action of the Participles *contemporaneous* with that of the principal verbs,—the whole action would naturally refer to the one event in which the promise and oath were both given, *viz.*, Gen. xxii., and we should render thus: "For in giving, or when He gave promise to Abraham, God, because, *etc.*, sware by Himself, saying, Surely blessing, *etc.;* and so (under these conditions of promise and blessing) Abraham waited patiently and obtained (=by patiently waiting obtained) the promise." So substantially Delitzsch. The objection to the former is that it makes an unnatural separation between the giving of the promise and the giving of the oath, (which the author seems to link closely together), and that it seems to attach a special significance to the period of the giving of the oath, which does not really belong to it, for although the promise was then repeated with a special fulness and emphasis, yet it was substantially but a repetition of the earlier promises, while Abraham's receiving his son from threatened death, which then occurred, took place *before* the utterance of the oath, and could be conceived to stand in no consecutive relation to it. The objection to the second construction would seem to be, that if the reference is only to the promise and oath of Gen. xxii., then all the earlier promises are apparently ignored, and therefore all Abraham's patient waiting since they were given, could scarcely come into the account. But to this we may reply, I think, that it is not a matter of importance to the writer to distinguish the *separate times and forms* of the promise which was made to Abraham; but he naturally, in referring to the promise, takes that occasion in which the promise was finally, and with the greatest fulness and emphasis repeated, and ratified by an oath: while the μακροθυμήσας refers to Abraham's entire, patient waiting for the fulfilment of the Divine promise, and the ἐπέτυχεν, as it seems to me, refers mainly not to that which Abraham experienced in his life-time, but to the reward of his faith and patience, which, commencing in his life-time, continued on into eternity. I would thus regard ἐπαγγειλάμενος as referring specially indeed to the promise of Gen. xxii., where it stands connected with the oath, but to this in reality as the representative of God's whole collective promise to Abraham; and the καὶ οὕτως μακρ. ἐπέτ. *and thus waiting patiently he obtained, etc.*, as virtually covering Abraham's bearing during the entire period after God had made to him His promises. I prefer, therefore, substantially Delitzsch's construction. To make, as Alford does, ἐπαγγειλάμενος, refer to the time of the *oath* (*when he promised, he swore*) and yet refer μακροθ. ἐπέτυχεν back to Abraham's having obtained the promise *in the birth of a son* in consequence of his long and patient waiting, seems specially inconsistent, and totally confuses the passage.—K.].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The promises of God, in so far as they are declarations of the time and words of the Almighty One, have, in themselves, the pledge and power of their accomplishment. But the Searcher of hearts condescends in His love to the needs of men, has respect to the weakness of those that are assailed, and gives to them for the strengthening of their faith special pledges and guaranties for perfect reliableness in His promises. In accordance, however, with the *sacred* character of the relations which are hereby to be confirmed and enhanced, these pledges are themselves of a *moral* and *religious* nature; they point to eternity, have respect to the holy nature of God, and have value and significance only for him who is already a believer.

2. Inasmuch as *an oath* is a form of ratifying a declaration, in which the attributes just mentioned appear not perchance as *concomitant* merely, but as *constitutive*, and since for this reason an oath forms for *men* the highest form of solemn assurance, and sacred affirmation, it

becomes clear why precisely this sort of pledge is the most appropriate to the condescension of God, and the simplest and surest for the attainment of the proposed end.

3. From the nature and form of the oath as a solemn appeal to the omniscient Holy God for confirmation of the truth and credibility of a definite utterance, it follows that God can swear *only by Himself* (=so truly as I live), but that all appeal to this example of God in justification of the use of such a form of swearing among men, cannot be admissible.

4. The promises of God enter with determining power into the course of history. They are not mere words, but are *germs of blessing and salvation* implanted in the souls of believers, with which he who receives and awaits them *grows* into an increasingly vital union, and attains to the richness of the promise.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The undeserved goodness of God toward us shows itself, specially: 1. in the promises of immeasurable blessing; 2. in giving assurance of their reliableness; 3. in the experience of their fulfilment.—Only they who wait in faith attain to what God has promised to them in His grace. —The compassion and faithfulness of God must be responded to by us with faith and steadfastness.—The sacredness of the oath through the example of God.

STARKE:—O happy people, for whose sake God swears an oath! and miserable they who will not trust to His oath.—Material blessing is a benefit, but spiritual blessing is a far greater. If thou hast the latter, cheerfully resign the former; but if God gives thee both, thou art doubly blessed.—To throw forward is not to throw aside; deferral is not reversal; God does every thing at its right time; wait in hope; what He has promised to thee, will be done for thee.

RIEGER:—God's entire way from the beginning, has been in the path of *waiting*. God gave *promises;* to these faith had to attach itself, and make its way through all difficulties.

VI.

Exhortation to Christians to hold fast to the promise which has been in such a manner assured to them.

CHAPTER VI. 16–20.

16 For men verily [indeed, μέν][1] swear by the greater: and an oath for confirmation *is*
to them an end of all strife [and to them a confirmatory limit to all gainsaying is an
17 oath]. Wherein God, willing [wishing] more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of
[the] promise the immutability of his counsel [purpose], confirmed *it* by [interposed
18 with] an oath: That by two immutable things, in which *it was* [is] impossible for God
to lie, we might [may] have a strong consolation [incitement], who have fled for refuge
19 to lay hold upon the hope set before us: Which *hope* we have as an anchor of the
soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that [the part] within the vail;
20 Whither [literally *where*, ὅπου] the forerunner is [*om.* is] for us [on our behalf]
entered, *even* [*om.* even] Jesus, made [becoming] a high priest for ever after the
order of Melchisedek.

[1] Ver. 16.—*Μέν* is wanting in Sin. A. B. D*. 47. 53, [and is expunged by Lach., Bl., Lün.; but retained by Tisch., Del., Alf., but of course before they had the testimony of Sin. It seems on the whole not unnatural, and yet as the following clause is not added with a contrasted *θεὸς δέ*, but rather as if filling out the thought, (*ἐν ᾧ*), I should prefer to follow the authorities that omit it.—K.].

[Ver. 16.—*Μέν* rendered as often in our Ep. in Eng. ver., *verily;* but always improperly. It is never a particle of emphasis but of *concession*, or simply where the two members are equally balanced, of *contrast; to be sure, it is true, indeed.*—*πάσης αὐτοῖς ἀντιλογίας, of all gainsaying to them=of all their gainsaying;* here not, *strife* as between equals or rivals, but *contradiction, gainsaying*, as of one who questions the assertion, or doubts the promise of another.—*Εἰς βεβαίωσιν* belongs apparently to *πέρας*, not to ὅρκος=*a limit for confirmation*, a limit or end designed for and producing confirmation.—Ὁ ὅρκος, *the oath*—the article *generic*, that thing called *oath*.

Ver. 17.—Ἐν ᾧ, *In which matter*=in which state of the case, *viz.*, the confirmatory power of the oath: ᾧ neuter (with Bl., De W., Thol., Ebr., Lün., Del., *etc.*), not masc., agreeing with ὅρκῳ.—*βουλόμενος, wishing, θέλων* might be more properly rendered *willing.*—*ἐπιδεῖξαι* more than simply *show* (*δηλόω, φανερόω*) or even *point out* (*δεῖξαι*); rather *exhibit, make an exhibition of, display; ἐπίδειξις*, Greek rhetorical term for *display, exhibition.* The term thus carries with it an idea of more *formality* than is implied in the simple *show.*—*ἐμεσίτευσεν*, hardly *confirmed;* rather, *came between*, to wit, Himself and His promise, *interposed*.

Ver. 18.—*παράκλησιν*, not here *consolation* (which the context disfavors), but *encouragement, incitement, exhortation* (so Del., Moll, *Ermunterung*, Alf., *etc.*).—*κρατῆσαι, to seize upon, to lay hold of*, (Eng. ver., De W., Thol., Del., Alf., *etc.*), or with Moll, *hold fast*. If we render *hold fast*, it would seem more natural to connect it with *παράκλ. ἔχωμεν* (though Moll

constructs it with καταφυγόντες). If *lay hold of* it is more naturally, with most, constructed with καταφυγ. *fled for refuge to lay hold.* In favor of *lay hold* is, as mentioned by Alf., the Aor. tense; to *hold on to* would seem to require the Pres. κρατεῖν. On the other hand the construction παράκλ. ἔχωμεν κρατ., *may have strong incitement to hold on to*, would make a sentiment eminently in harmony with the context. But as καταφυγ. is rather harshly left *absolute*, and κρατῆσαι, Aor. can hardly be rendered *hold fast*, I think the rendering of the Eng. ver. preferable to any other, agreeing with Moll in the construction, but not in rendering κρατῆσαι.

Ver. 19.—*Εἰσερχομένην, ἀσφαλῆν τε καὶ βεβαίαν.* I am strongly inclined to regard all these words as agreeing with ἣν, scil., ἐλπίδα, and not with ἄγκυραν. The construction is perfectly easy and natural, and avoids the figure of the *anchor entering, etc.*, which though we may, when it is once admitted, defend and even find beautiful, yet must be conceded to be at first view harsh and unnatural.—*Εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον, into the part within=within.*

Ver. 20.—ὅπου, *where*, with εἰσῆλθεν, used pregnantly for ὅποι, *whither=whither* He entered and *where* He remained. —πρόδρομος, *forerunner*, placed emphatically at the beginning of the clause, Ἰησοῦς, emphatically at its close.—ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, *on behalf of us.*—εἰσῆλθεν, *entered*, historical, not (as Eng. ver.), *is entered.*—γενόμενος, *becoming*, when He entered, not *being made.*—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 16. For men, indeed, *etc.*—Statement of the reason why God has employed the swearing of an oath, and that in the form here described. Ἀντιλογία never has the signification of *dubitatio, doubt,* (Grot., Cram.) though it may have that of *judicial controversy* (Theophyl., Erasm , Schlicht., *etc.*). Here, however, the meaning of *gainsaying* is to be preferred with Bleek, inasmuch as the subject is the credibility of *the promises of God.*

Ver. 17. In which matter, *etc.*—Ἐν ᾧ refers not to the oath (Vulg., Primas.), nor to the transaction between Abraham and God (Bez., *etc.*), but introduces the deduction drawn from ver. 16, and is=*in accordance with which relation or circumstance, viz.*, that the oath is the highest means of confirmation, or, *on account of which.* Ver. 18 shows that the "heirs of the promise" cannot be *merely* the pious of the Old Testament (Calv., Thol., *etc.*), while neither are we authorized (with Lün.) to restrict the language entirely to Christians. This latter restriction would annihilate the *historical* basis of the entire *passage;* while, in fact, the historical illustration forms the starting-point for a more expanded statement. Beza and others erroneously take περισσότερον as ="over and above," *ex abundanti.* For the point of the statement is not to affirm that God's truthful word needs in itself no confirmation by an oath, but that God, in a condescending regard to the relations and usages of men, has given His promise in a more emphatic manner than by the mere assurance.

Ver. 18. A strong incitement, *etc.*—The nature of the connection forbids our taking παράκλησις (with Luth. and most others, after the Vulg.) as=*consolation.* Κρατῆσαι, as Inf. Aor. marks *purpose*, and is not=*lay hold of, seize upon* (De W., Thol., *etc.*), but *hold fast.* The readers *have* hope; what they lack is πληροφορία. But this Infin. is not dependent on παράκλησιν ἔχωμεν, under which construction οἱ καταφυγόντες, *they that have fled for refuge*, denotes *the fugitives* or *secured ones*, and is taken absolutely (Œc., Theoph., Grot., Bl., Lün.) as an independent idea, whether εἰς θεόν, be understood or not. The προκειμένη ἐλπίς, is in that case the hope, *lying, as it were, in readiness* in the soul. If, on the contrary (with Primas., Erasm., Bez., Grot., De W., Ebr., Del., *etc.*), we make κρατῆσαι dependent on οἱ καταφυγ., then καταφυγεῖν receives the undoubtedly legitimate meaning of *profugere*, and the προκειμ. ἐλπίς, is the hope, *objectively* regarded, which belongs to and lies before Christians. If author and readers have already, as Christians, taken their refuge in the holding fast to this hope, they must receive a strong *encouragement* to this holding on from the sworn promises of God. In harmony also with the *objective* meaning of ἐλπίς, is the following clause, in which the author by uniting the two images of *sea* and *temple*, glides gracefully back to his main theme. The anchor, elsewhere unmentioned in Scripture, appears often in the classics and on ancient coins, as a symbol of hope. The several predicates—particularly the last one, "entering, *etc.*,"—intimate that the anchor is found not merely in the soul, but at the same time in heaven, and this too, not, as is commonly maintained, by the fact of the soul's having thrown in thither its anchor of hope, but by the fact that *Christ*, as our high-priest, *has preceded us thither;* and the soul, although it as yet sees Him not, withdrawn as He is into the inner sanctuary, and His life hidden in God, yet *in faith stands connected with Him*, and by this connection attains, on the one hand, like the ship riding at anchor, to *rest* in this restless world, and on the other, to the possibility and the assurance of being itself drawn thither, where, holding it securely, its anchor already lies. For assuming a *blending* of the subjective and objective signification of ἐλπίς, there is no adequate reason; nor is προκειμ. ἐλπίς=ἐλπ. τῶν προκειμένων (Bl., De W., Thol.). Only we must guard against taking the *objective* ἐλπίς, in the sense of the *res sperata* (the *thing* hoped for); but take it in the same way in which we speak *specifically* of Christian *faith.*—Ὅπου, *where*, instead of ὅποι, *whither*, implies the *remaining* at the attained goal, and ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, is not to be connected with πρόδρομος (as Heinr., Böhm., Thol., Ebr.), but with εἰσῆλθεν.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The strongest assurance of our salvation as purposed by God, and the most powerful incitement to a believing maintenance of our Christian hope, lies partly in the *reliableness* which belongs to those sure promises which God for our establishment has confirmed by an oath; partly in the *fact*, that Jesus, as forerunner, has already entered into heaven on our behalf, and there mediates forever for our salvation, embodying in Himself not only the Aaronic but the Melchisedek high-priesthood, and carrying the type of that priesthood to perfection.

2. That which holds of the word of promise made to Abraham and confirmed by the oath of God, holds also of that word of promise in regard to the everlasting high-priesthood of Christ (Ps. cx. 4) which *in like manner was accompanied*

by an oath, and which to us as Christians is spesially important.

3. The *admissibleness* of the oath of *promise*, as well as that of *asseveration*, within the Christian world, is by this passage of Scripture assured beyond doubt, which in fact derives the *strength* of the exhortation from the two-fold assurance of the promise by God's word and oath, and regards the latter as the authorized form of *mediatorial* interposition, which by appealing to God puts an end to gainsaying with regard to the matter in question, and is followed by a consequent βεβαίωσις. "And the case stands thus; that our intention is accredited by the oath, but the oath itself is accredited by God; since so far from God's being worthy of credit on account of His oath, the oath rather derives its credit from God." (PHILO). The idea that God may make Himself surety for man appears also in Job xvii. 3; Isa. xxxviii. 14.

4. The substance of *Christian hope* is the inheritance of the promise; its goal is union with the exalted Christ; its foundation the word of God; its root is living faith. It forms thus, not merely an indispensable, but powerfully efficacious means for the maintenance of our connection with the unseen world, and for the attainment of the heavenly blessings which are promised to us.

5. "As the Aaronic high-priest, after he had, in the outer court, slain the heifer as a sin-offering for himself and his house, and then slain the goat as a sin-offering for the congregation, entered with the blood of the slaughtered victim into the typical holiest of all, so Jesus, after offering up Himself in sacrifice upon earth, and shedding on earth His own blood, has entered into the Heavenly holiest of all, in order thereby to accomplish, once for all, an expiation on our behalf, and there perpetually to represent us; but at the same time (ch. x. 19–21), in order to break the path, and to open the way, for us, who are eternally to be where He is. That He thus, in His entrance on our behalf, is at the same time our precursor, this it is which distinguishes Him from the legal high-priests of a community that was absolutely excluded from the inner sanctuary. And not only this: He is not merely high-priest, but also king; and He is a high-priest not merely for a season, but forever." (DEL.).

6. "What a firm anchoring-ground for hope is God's eternal heaven, by which our Jesus is encompassed. Since after having suffered for us, He has also, on our behalf, been so highly exalted. We see Him not, since the place of God to which He has gone is hidden from our carnal eyes, and in so far, there is still a veil between us and Him. But the anchor of our hope, unrestrained by this limitation, reaches into those silent deeps of the spirit world into which He has withdrawn from our senses, and amidst the wild waves of life keeps our souls firm and tranquil." (DEL.).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The unchangeableness of the purpose of God: *a.* to what that purpose refers itself; *b.* by what its unchangeableness is assured; *c.* to what this assurance should incite us.—Nature, object and justification of the Christian oath.—The maintenance of our Christian hope: 1. as it is rendered difficult; *a.* by unsteadiness of faith; *b.* by the condition of the world; *c.* by the veil before the future; 2. as it is made easy; *a.* by the word of promise; *b.* by the oath of God; *c.* by the entrance of Jesus into heaven.—The advantage of Jesus' entrance into the heavenly sanctuary; *a.* to Him; *b.* to us.

STARKE:—Believers can, with steadfast faith, be certain of eternal life.—The purposes of God are in part without condition, and are thus surely executed; but those which belong to the economy of salvation are under a certain condition established and bound to this economy.—The first attribute of faith, is, in the feeling of our deficiency in every good, and of our extreme need, to look around after Jesus, in order to seek from Him help and counsel. Its next attribute, is to lay hold of the blessedness that has been obtained through Christ, and to hold fast with manly strength and power to the blessedness once obtained, and on account of no threat or danger, come they as they may, timidly, to cast it away.—God deals with us as with a father's spirit, since while He knows our weakness, *to wit*, that as with the aged Moses, both our arms speedily sink down, and become faint and weary, so He sustains with these two strong pillars, His unchangeable truth, and His priceless oath.—Word, faith and hope must stand together; the word lays the foundation; Faith builds thereon; and Hope expectantly stretches herself forth from time into eternity.

RIEGER:—By keeping in view the oath of God in regard to His gracious promise, we are incited to follow on in faith and patience.—The Christian hope is a *sure* anchor, with which we cannot receive harm, and a *firm* one, as consisting entirely of God's counsel at once firm and confirmed by an oath.

HEUBNER:—The hope of the Christian has a limitless reach. It reaches outwardly into eternity, inwardly into the sanctuary of God.—The surety of our hope is Christ. His entrance into the sanctuary is the pledge of our own future entrance into it.

AHLFELD:—The ascension of Christ is the final pledge of our entrance into glory. 1. There is a hidden kingdom of glory. 2. Into this our hope casts its anchor. 3. Christ's entrance therein renders this hope a certainty.

SECOND SECTION.

The eternal and perfect high-priesthood of Jesus Christ.

I.

The person of Melchisedek has, as a type of Christ, a triple superiority to the Levitical priests.

CHAPTER VII. 1-10.

For this Melchisedek, king of Salem, priest[1] of the most high God, who met Abra-
2 ham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him; To whom also[2]
Abraham gave a tenth part of all;[2] first being [being in the first place] by interpreta-
tion King of righteousness, and after that [in the second place] also King of Salem,
3 which is, King of peace; Without father, without mother, without descent [without
recorded lineage], having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like
[having been assimilated] unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually [perpet-
4 ually, *in perpetuum*]. Now [And] consider how great this man *was*, unto whom even
the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth part of the spoils [choicest spoils, ἀκροθινίων].
5 And verily they that are of the sons of Levi, who [they, indeed, who, as being of the
sons of Levi], receive the office of priest, have a commandment to take tithes of the
people according to the law, that is, of their brethren, [even] though they come out
6 of the loins of Abraham; But he whose descent is not counted from them, received
7 tithes of [hath tithed] Abraham,[3] and [hath] blessed him that had [possessed] the pro-
8 mises. And without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better [superior, κρείτ-
τονος]. And here [indeed] men that die receive tithes; but there he *receiveth them*,
9 of whom it is witnessed that he liveth. And as I may so say [so to speak], Levi[4]
10 also, who receiveth tithes, paid tithes [hath been tithed] in Abraham. For he was
yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedek[5] met him.

[1] Ver. 1.—The Art. before ὑψίστου, is attested by Sin. A. C. D. E. K. L., 28, 44, 46, 48.

[2] Ver. 2.—The καί is sustained against the authority of B. D*. E*. by Sin. A. C. D***. E**. K. L. and the minusc.

[3] Ver. 6.—The Art. before Abraham is erased by some, on the authority of B. C. D*. 23, 57, 109. The Sin. has it from a later hand. [It is retained by Tisch. on preponderating authority.—K.].

[4] Ver. 9.—The form Λευΐς is found in A. B. C*. Λευει in Sin., where the corrector has put Λευεις, which is received by Tisch., Ed. VII.

[5] Ver. 10.—The Art. before Melch. is after Sin. B. C*. D*. 73, 118, to be omitted.

[Ver. 2.—ἐμέρισεν, *apportioned, imparted*.—πρῶτον μέν, *in the first place*.—ἔπειτα δέ, *and then, and in the next place*. In the classics ἔπειτα without δέ, commonly answers to πρῶτον μέν.

Ver. 3.—ἀγενεαλόγητος, *ungenealogized, without recorded lineage*; not as Eng. ver., *without descent*.—ἀφωμοιωμένος, *having been assimilated*, or *rendered similar*.—μένει, *remaineth, abideth, emphatic*.—εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, *perpetually*.

Ver. 4.—θεωρεῖτε δε, *and contemplate, behold*; not, "*now* consider." "Now" impairs the natural flow of the sentence. Alford's "*But* observe" is objectionable.—*The patriarch Abraham:* in the original ὁ πατριάρχης, is separated from Ἀβραάμ, and thrown emphatically over to the end of the sentence.—ἐκ τῶν ἀκροθινίων, *from the top of the heap*, hence, *the selectest*, or *choicest spoils*.

Ver. 5.—καὶ οἱ μέν, *and they indeed*, or *while* they. Eng. ver., *and verily*, which Alf. says "is rather too strong." It is not merely "too strong;" 'verily,' as a rendering of μέν is totally inappropriate.—οἱ ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν—λαμβ. *they indeed*, or *while they, who*, of the sons of Levi (or possibly, with Del., *as being of the sons of Levi*) *receive the priesthood*; or perhaps as suggested by Alf., "*they of the sons of Levi when they receive* (*when receiving*) *the priesthood*.—ἀποδεκατοῦν (Sin B. D.[1] ἀποδεκατοιν, received by Alf.), *to tithe*.—κατὰ τὸν νόμον, belongs to ἐντολὴν ἔχουσιν—καίπερ ἐξεληλυθότας, *although having come out*.

Ver. 6.—δεδεκάτωκεν, *hath tithed*—εὐλόγηκεν, *hath blessed*—construction *chiastic*, the verb preceding in one clause, and following in the next.

Ver. 7.—ὑπὸ τοῦ κρείττονος, *by the greater, superior*, not, *of the better*.

Ver. 8.—Καὶ ὧδε μέν, *and here indeed*, or, *while here, i. e*, in the case of the Levitical priests.

Ver. 9.—ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, *so to speak*, very well rendered as to the sense, by the Eng. ver., *as I may so say*. Some take the phrase as—*in a word*, of which and the "so to speak," Alf. says that they, "in fact both run into one," which is incorrect. "So to speak," always implies a certain conscious license on the part of the speaker, which *in a word* does not necessarily nor ordinarily imply at all. The former, *so to speak*, is, as in the immense majority of cases, the meaning.—δεδεκάτωται, *hath been tithed*—stands before our eyes or recorded as tithed: Eng. ver., *was* tithed, exchanges the perfect for Aor., and loses in accuracy and picturesqueness. —K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 1. **For this Melchisedec**, *etc.*—To establish the justice *with* which—not merely to explain the sense *in* which—the author at ch. vi. 20 has referred to Ps. cx. 1, he shows primarily that Melchisedek was a higher priest than the Levitical, because in the narrative Gen. xiv. 18–20, he has been put forward as type of the everlasting Priest, and because in Abraham he received tithes from Levi. The vv. 1–8 form a period with the verb μένει, *abideth;* so that we need not, and should not, with Erasm., Luth., Calv., *etc.*, supply ἦν with the opening verse. The author first brings together the *historical traits* which the Scripture narrative assigns to Melchisedek, then from πρῶτον μὲν he gives his *interpretation* of them in which he but follows in the steps of the Psalmist. Melchisedek is not *in reality*, like to the Son of God, but in the *Scripture representation* he has according to the purpose of the Holy Spirit, that he might be a type of the Messiah, been *made like* or *assimilated* to him. Ἀφωμοιοῦν has this signification in Plato (*Rep.* VII. 517, B; VIII. 564, B). Nor do ἀπάτωρ ἀμήτωρ involve any supernatural mode of coming into the world, but imply that his progenitors are either of humble origin, or are unknown, or are mentioned in no historical narrative, or came not into account in any legal relations (Examples in Bl.). Ἀγενεαλόγητος, also, means not (like ἀγένητος) *without lineage*, but without *recorded lineage*, without a registered descent. Hence the following words indicate neither that he came from heaven, nor that he was snatched away into it, (BRAUN, AKERSLOOT, NAGEL in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1849, II. 332 ff.; NICKEL in *Reuter's Repert.*, 1858, p. 102 ff., Alf., *etc.*). An everlasting existence is not ascribed to Melch. But neither is the language to be restricted to the beginning and termination of his *priesthood* (Camero, Seb. Schmidt, Limb., Kuin., Hofm.), inasmuch as *personally* he has been made the type of the Son of God.

[Alford (after Bleek) is still inclined to find in the author's language some marvellous and inexplicable mystery investing the person of Melchisedek, though he confesses himself totally unable to conjecture what it may be. The emphatic phrase "having neither beginning of days nor end of life," he conceives can scarcely be conceived as applying to a mere man. The language is certainly very striking, yet I cannot conceive it more striking than the purposes which call it forth, and these seem to me abundantly sufficient to account for its striking and apparently mysterious character. The author's purpose is to show the points in Melchisedek's recorded life and position, which fitted him in his priesthood to be a type of the priestly Son of God. For this purpose he turns to the record of the Old Testament, and draws his reasonings alike from what *is* and what is *not* there stated; alike from the *recorded facts* of Melchisedek's transient and remarkable appearance, and the *silence* of the sacred narrative concerning all preceding or subsequent facts appertaining to his history. Both the record and the silence are equally remarkable. In the one Melchisedek appears as a king in relations which associate him at once with Righteousness and with Peace, as priest of the Most High God in the midst of idolatrous communities, and as blessing and receiving tithes from Abraham, the spiritual heir of the world. In the other, a personage so great and so remarkable, is, contrary to all the usage of the sacred history, which is generally very studious and exact in giving the lineage of its important personages, and usually notices alike their birth and their death, passed over without a solitary intimation as to his lineage or family relations, as to his birth or his death. The reason of this silence on the part of the Spirit that dictated the narrative, cannot be doubtful. It is intended to exhibit Melchisedek under personal relations, which should fit him also to be the priestly type of the High-Priest of the New Covenant. The facts seem abundantly sufficient to account for the Old Testament silence, and for the New Testament representation. Our author looks back to the Old Testament to see what there was in the record of Melchisedek to explain the language of the Psalm regarding his peculiar Priesthood. These facts present themselves prominently to him, and he exhibits them in such a manner as to bring out most strongly and forcibly the typical character of Melchisedek. We must remember that the sacred historian is generally studious to give the lineage of all the sacred persons with whom he has to do, and almost invariably signalizes the fact of their death. Here we have a singular and marked exception. Melchisedek, evidently, by the relations in which he appears in Genesis, one of the most extraordinary men of sacred history, is yet passed over without one gleam of light shed on the darkness either of his past or his future. He thus stands on the sacred page—amidst a narrative which, in its faithful record of births and deaths, seems intended to illustrate the truth that "Death reigned from Adam to Moses,"—as one *who liveth.* Without wishing, therefore, to derogate in the least from the depth of our author's meaning, or from the dignity and mystery that invest the person of Melchisedek; without wishing to reduce him to the prosaic level of ordinary humanity, I yet can see no reason for finding in him any thing superhuman, or for departing from the prevailing view of the best modern expositors, which seems to me to have judiciously and wisely discarded all the old mysteries regarding Melchisedek. The truth is, our author's language itself receives far greater depth and significance by our making its statements regarding Melchisedek derive their peculiar character and dignity from the supernatural personage *whom he represented*, than from any supposed supernatural attributes of Melchisedek himself. And we must remember, too, that for all the purposes which Melchisedek was to subserve as a *type*, the appearance, the mere *representation* of these qualities in him, answers precisely the same purpose as the realities. Here the principle truly applies, "*De non existentibus, et non apparentibus, eadem est ratio.*"—K.]

By Salem we are probably to understand Jerusalem (which bears this shortened name also at Ps. lxxvi. 3; comp. KNOBEL *Gen.*, 2 Aufl., p. 149 ff.) although according to Judges xix. 10, the older name of Jerusalem was *Jebus*, and we

find in JEROME (Ep. 126 *ad Euagrium*) that later tradition makes the Salim (or Salumias) of Jno. iii. 23, lying eight Roman miles south of Sycthopolis, the residence of Melchisedek. Bleek, Tuch., Ewald, Alf., decide after Primas., Rel., Rosenm., *etc.*, in favor of this latter place, which is also probably mentioned Judith iv. 4. The author says designedly not εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, but εἰς τὸ διηνεκές=*perpetually*, because the priesthood which he has in sacred history, from the beginning to the end, without interruption and without transmission to another, is *his own* (HOFM. *Schriftb.* I. 402; 2 Ed. II. 1, 550, Del., Stier, *etc.*, after Theodor. Mops.); not because his priesthood is perpetuated in Christ, the type remaining in the antitype (Thol. after Primas., Haymo, Thom. Aquin.), nor because the name of Priest, according to Rev., is applied to all the blessed (AUBERL. *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1857, III. 497).

VER. 4. **And consider how great,** *etc.*—The *metabatic* δέ introduces the consideration of the other side of the matter. It is more in harmony with the impassioned and elevated style of the passage, to take θεωρεῖτε as Imper. than as Indic. Πηλίκος refers ordinarily, according to the connection, to *age*, to *size*, or to *moral* greatness; but here to exaltedness and dignity of *position*. The καί is to be referred, not to Abraham (Luth., Grot., *etc.*), but to δεκάτην, as indicated by the order of the words. 'Ακροθίνια literally, *the top of the heap*, denotes commonly the first fruits of the harvest offered to the Deity; sometimes, as here, the choicest spoils of war selected out as a sacred offering. Of such select portions consisted the tithe of the entire booty, that was now presented by Abraham: the *entire spoils* cannot be denoted by ἀκροθίνια, as supposed by Chrys., Erasm., Luth., Calv., *etc.* The name of honor ὁ πατριάρχης, which denotes the ancestral father and head of the Israelitish nation, is applied Acts ii. 29, to David, and Acts vii. 8, 9, to the twelve sons of Jacob.

VER. 5. **And they indeed who, from the sons of Levi,** *etc.*—In the words ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λευί, Bl., De W., Lün., *etc.*, take ἐκ *partitively;* but it is better, with Hofm., Del., *etc.*, taken *causatively*. For the contrast is not drawn between those who as descendants of Aaron were priests, and those who were mere Levites, but between the *Levitical* priests and Mel., who has tithed Abraham, although (μὴ γενεαλογ. ἐξ αὐτῶν) not deriving his lineage from them. [The reason is, however, hardly conclusive. For although the writer does not intend a contrast between the priests and the other sons of Levi, yet the *natural method* of designating the Levitical priest is precisely that which is here employed, *viz.*, those of the sons of Levi who received the priesthood.—K.]. 'Εξ αὐτῶν is by some erroneously referred to the Israelites, and by Grot. to Levi and Abraham together. A *second* contrast is this, that the Israelites received the tithes on the ground of a *legal ordinance*, while Melchisedek received it as a spontaneous offering. Add to this, that the Levites had to do with their *countrymen* over whom, although brethren, they were placed, and to whom they were at the same time restricted, while the relation of Melchisedec to Abraham was entirely different. The last point is the relation *of him who blesses* to the man who as Patriarch is the historical bearer of those promises of God which include the blessings. 'Ιερατεία denotes the priestly service, and the priestly prerogative. In all other passages of our Epistle stands ἱερωσύνη=priesthood, *i. e.*, priestly office and dignity (comp. Sir. xlv. 7 with xlv. 24). But even in the LXX. the meanings of the two words run into each other. Since, now, at Num. xviii. 1, the term ἱερατεία is used to designate the *Aaronic* service, and Jehovah calls the Levites in relation to Aaron τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου, Biesenthal makes (see DEL., p. 278 *Anm.*) the sagacious conjecture that our author refers to Num. xviii. 25–32, where the Levites are required to give the tenth of the tenth to the priests, and that, instead of ἀποδεκατοῦν τὸν λαόν, we are to read at Hebr. vii. 5, Λευίν. This would remove the difficulty occasioned by the fact that our author ascribes to the priests what, according to Lev. xxvii. 30, belonged to the Levites, *viz.*, to receive all the tithes in Israel from Jehovah, to whom all the tithes of the land belong. For we cannot along with Bl. (followed by Bisp., while most recent intpp. do not touch the difficulty in question, and Ebr. seeks to evade it by a rendering inconsistent with the order of the words) assume that in the period after the exile the priests perhaps took the whole tithes for their own subsistence, and the maintenance of the temple service, and that the remaining members of the tribe of Levi surrendered to those who were actually engaged in the temple service what was demanded for their support. The passages Nehem. x. 38ff.; xii. 44; xiii. 10; Tob. i. 6–8, state precisely the reverse. The simplest solution is the assumption of the older comm. (Drus., Seb. Schmidt, *etc.*), that ἀποδεκατοῦν, is to be understood of the *indirect* tithing of the people by the priests, in that they received their tenth from the tenth of the Levites.

[The fact that there should ever have been any trouble about the solution of this point, shows how easily difficulties are found in the Scriptures, by an unnecessary rigidness of verbal interpretation. In a *detailed account* of the Mosaic Institutions, we should of course expect a statement of the precise relations of the priests to the Levites, and of the Levites to the people. But in a brief *reference* to them made merely for the sake of illustrating a principle, it is sufficient to state the general fact that the Levitical priests tithed the people, *i. e.*, had their subsistence by the tithing of the people, without any intimation of the *mode* in which it was done, whether by tithing directly or through another body.—K.].

The conjecture of Ribera that under the term λαός, the author *jointly includes* the Levites, and that of Thom. Aquin. that the author starts from the supposition that the *Priestly class* furnish the *ground* and *purpose* of all the tithing, inasmuch as they alone *receive* tithes without rendering them, are both to be rejected. The Infin. form ἀποδεκατοῖν adopted by Tisch. after B. D*. (which MSS. also read at Matth. xiii. 32, κατασκηνοῖν), appears to be of Alexandrian origin; comp. ζηλοῖν as a var. lec. in DRESSEL *Patr. Apost.* p. 322, n. 4; and στεφανοῖν, after an Inscription given by KRÜGER (I. 1, § 32, *Anm.* 7). Seb. Schmidt, Böhme, *etc.*, connect the κατὰ τὸν

νόμον with τὸν λαόν, Bleek, Bisp., Lün., with ἐντολὴν ἔχουσιν, the majority with ἀποδεκατοῦν.

VER. 8. **Of whom it is witnessed that he liveth.**—Inasmuch as the Melchisedek of history is certainly dead, while yet the author is speaking not of an *office* but of a *person*, Cappell., Heins., Storr, in entire violation of the context, take the subject to be Christ. Equally unnecessary too is it with Theod., Bl., *etc.*, to appeal to Ps. cx., which speaks of the *Antitype* of Melchisedek. We need only refer for the explanation of the language to Gen. xiv. (Œc., Calv., Este, *etc.*), as we have here but a variation in the statement of ver. 3, that Melchisedek is "without end of life." The person of Melchisedek is indeed treated as historical, but only in so far as he is a type of the Christian Messiah.

[Alford heads his comm. on ver. 8 thus: "*Second item of superiority* in that Melchisedek's is an *enduring*, the Levitical a *transitory* priesthood." This language is not quite accurate. The author is not comparing the priesthood of Melchisedek with the Levitical priesthood, but illustrating the *personal greatness* of Melchisedek, which he does by showing his superiority to Abraham, and then again his superiority to the Levitical priests, in that while they receive tithes as dying men, he receives them as one of whom it is testified that he *liveth*. His *priesthood* is not primarily in question.—K.].

VER. 9. **And so to speak,** *etc.*—In itself ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν may mean, "to say in a word (briefly)," and "so to speak" (Theophyl.). The former signification which is here adopted by Camerar., Beng., *etc.*, is much less appropriate than the *second*, which with the Vulg. and Luth. is maintained by most intpp. [I doubt the classical use of the phrase in the *first* signification. At all events it is incomparably more common with Greek writers in the *second*, which is here in like manner most decidedly in accordance with the context.—K.]. The phrase implies that the author is not speaking with strict accuracy, but only with *virtual* or approximative truth. Δι' Ἀβραάμ is not *on account of* Abraham (August., Phot.), but, *through* Abraham; the Gen. not the Acc.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. In the biographies of persons who in the Holy Scripture itself have received a typical significance, we are to regard not merely what is *recorded* of them, but also what, in regard to them, is designedly *past in silence*. So of the silence of the Holy Scripture regarding the origin and end of Melchisedek, who, with bread and wine in his hands, went forth from his royal city to meet and bless Abraham in the vale of Shittim, or the *king's dale*, which 2 Sam. xviii. 18 is mentioned as the place in which Absalom erected a monument, and is sought for in the neighborhood of Jerusalem (*Jos. Antt.* 1, 10, 2). The conjectures of Jewish and Christian interpreters in DEYLING (*Observv. Sacr.* II. 71 seq.) which identify Mel. with Shem, Ham, or Enoch, are as much opposed to the history, as the conjecture of NORK (*Bibl. Mythol.* I. 154) who here finds the Phœnician god Sydik, *i. e.*, צְדִיק = Kronos, Saturn. He is simply an *otherwise unknown* king, whose meeting with Abraham, however, is, in the history of redemption, at once of the greatest historical and typical importance.

2. In the narrative itself lies the basis of the author's typical interpretation. For Melchisedek is designated Gen. xiv. 19, 22 priest (כֹּהֵן) of the Most High God (אֵל עֶלְיוֹן). He thus not merely performed *priestly acts*, as did also Abraham as princely chief, and as did every father of a family. The language points to a priesthood *distinct* from his royal authority, and from the *patriarchal* character, which was united with royalty *only in the person* of Melchisedek. When, therefore Abraham bows before this priestly king, receives his blessing, and renders to him tithes, he recognizes not merely their relationship in modes of faith, in their common worship—a worship untainted by idolatry—of the God who created the world (while, at the same time, Abraham on his own part emphasizes, v. 22, the specific reference of his faith to *Jehovah*, as the God who reveals himself in the work of human redemption), but he places himself *personally in a subordinate relation in respect of office* to this priestly king—a relation thus naturally and necessarily suggesting a typical explanation, and a *Messianic* reference. Historically, the phenomenon of his appearance is explicable in the fact that, according to Scripture itself, the worship of Jehovah, which characterized the descendants of Abraham (Gen. xxviii. 13; Ex. iii. 6) did not actually owe its origin to Abraham. Abraham is not the first professor of this faith, but only its main representative and transmitter among the children of Noah, as Seth among those of Adam. Just as at a later period, in contrast with the false *particularism* of the Jews, Jehovah is designated as the God who is מֵעוֹלָם, Ps. xc. 2; xciii. 2; ciii. 17, or מִקֶּדֶם, Hab. i. 12, so the Jehovah worshipped by Abraham appears in Gen. as the Creator of the world already worshipped by primitive men on the ground of the revelation of Himself. And the agency of Abraham in maintaining the knowledge and worship of this God, is expressed in the same words as that of Seth, Gen. iv. 26. In the statement, however, that men then "began to call on the name of Jehovah," the historian cannot intend to be understood that then absolutely the name of Jehovah was first made known; for but a little before the same name had been put in the mouth of Eve. He employs the term of the *religious worship* of Jehovah, which also at Ps. lxxix. 6; cxvi. 17; Is. xii. 4, this expression very decidedly designates.

3. The existence of *a priestly king*, entitled to *utter a blessing and to receive tithes*, and in this character *acknowledged by Abraham*—a personage who is indebted for his position to no lineal descent, or legal ordination, but who exercises a *ministry purely personal*, so that alike his origin and his end are veiled from our view, furnishes the natural ground and justification of the thought that a *non-Levitical* priesthood, outside indeed of the Mosaic legal enactments, yet still according *to the will of God*, holds

an authorized relation to the descendants of Abraham; nay, that the Messiah predicted (Ps. cx.) within the very sphere and by the very prophets of Judaism, as a priest after the order of Melchisedek, possesses alike in his royal priesthood and his personal character, *an infinite elevation* above the Levitical priests, and the Aaronic high-priests, and that to recognize this is a sacred duty of the Hebrews.

4. The typical elements which attach themselves to the Scripture account of Melchisedek are found not merely in *the acts which the Scripture* narrative ascribes to him, but also in the *significance of his name.* This designates him as a type of the *Prince of Peace,* Is. ix. 5, and *Branch of righteousness,* Jer. xxiii. 5; xxxiii. 15, who as a Ruler standing near to Jehovah, Jer. xxx. 21, coming forth from the midst of Israel, spreads righteousness and peace in the land, Ps. lxxii.; Mich. ii. 13; Jer. xxiii. 5 ff.: establishes them according to the Divine will, Ezek. xxxiv. 24; xxxvii. 25: in that He creates peace among the nations, Zech. ix. 10, and is himself Peace, (Mich. v. 5). This typical character is entirely overlooked by those who ascribe to our author the idea that Melchisedek came miraculously into life and miraculously departed from it, (NAGEL, *Zur Characteristik der Auffassung des A. T. im N. T.,* 1850); or that he is the incarnation of an angel (Orig., Didym.), or of the Holy Spirit; (The author of the *Quæst. in vet. et Nov. Test.* in Hilarius and the Ægyptian Hierakas, *Epiph. hær.,* 67); or of a Divine power transcending even Christ in majesty (the Melchisedekites, a section of the Theodotians), or of the Son of God Himself (Molinæus, Cunæus, Hottinger, D'Outrein, Starke and others, after some orthodox Fathers in *Epiphanius hær.,* 55).

5. "The Melchisedek of human history has indeed died; but the Melchisedek of sacred history lives without dying, fixed for ever as *one who lives* by the pen of the sacred historian, and thus stamped as type of the Son, the ever-living Priest." (DEL.).—"Likened, he says, to the Son of God." And wherein does this likeness display itself? In the fact that we know neither the end nor the beginning either of the one or the other; but of the one, because the beginning and the end are not recorded; of the other, because they have no existence." (Chrys.).—"As man, Christ was without Father, and as God, without mother; as high-priest He was without genealogy, and as Eternal Son of God without beginning and without end of days." (BISP.)—"Christ, in the Divine counsels, is before all figures and types: He is the original; all others are copies. They are modeled after Him, not He after them; so also Melchisedek after Jesus Christ, not Jesus Christ after Melchisedek."—(HEUBNER).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The appearance and work of Jesus Christ have been pointed out to us in the Old Testament not only by *words* of prophecy, but also by *types and figures* alike in persons and acts.—We understand the history of the world, only as we conceive it from the point of view of *sacred history,* and interpret it under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.—To what should we be moved by the thought that our actions have a far-reaching and profound influence *on the fortunes of our posterity?*—It is those who have been *already* blessed who are always receiving *new* blessing.—Pious men render mutual service to each other for the honor of God.

STARKE:—To heroes and warlike men, who venture their life to protect their country and people, belong respect, refreshment and intercessory prayer.—Happy are the kings who are kings of righteousness and of peace.—The Divine Administration has many a time wrought something through the primitive fathers, not merely for their sakes, but also for the sake of their posterity.

HEUBNER:—The priesthood of Christ, not the priesthood of the Law, is the source of all blessing.—To our Melchisedek belongs every thing in sacrifice, since we have all from Him and through Him.—Let us learn that our true nobility springs not from men but from Heaven; that we are to forget time, and think only of eternity.—The Levites take a tenth from their brethren; Melchisedek from Abraham; but Christ receives the reverence, the service of the whole world.

II.

The Old Testament itself predicts the abrogation of the Levitical high-priesthood which rests on the basis of the Mosaic law, and the merging of it in the eternal priesthood of the Messiah.

CHAPTER VII. 11–19.

11 If therefore [If indeed now, If to be sure now, εἰ μὲν οὖν] perfection were by [=through, διά] the Levitical priesthood, (for under it [on the basis of it, ἐπ' αὐτῆς][1] the people [have] received the law,) what further need *was there* [*om.* was there] that another [different, ἕτερον] priest should arise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after

12 the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed [transferred, μετατιθεμένης],
13 there is made [becometh] of necessity a change also of the law. For he of whom these
things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of [from] which no man gave [none hath
14 given] attendance at the altar. For *it is* evident that our Lord sprang [hath sprung] out
of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood [priests, ἱερέων].[2]
15 And it is yet far more [is still more abundantly] evident, for that [if, εἰ] after the
16 similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another [a different, ἕτερος] priest, Who is
made, not after the law of a carnal[3] commandment, but after the power of an endless
17 [indestructible] life. For he testifieth [is testified of, μαρτυρεῖται],[4] Thou *art* a
18 priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec. For there is verily [there becometh
indeed, γίνεται μέν] a disannulling of the [preceding] commandment going before [*om.*
going before] for the [on account of its] weakness and unprofitableness thereof [*om.*
19 thereof]; For the law made nothing perfect, but [(for the law perfected nothing), and]
the bringing in of a better hope *did* [*om.* did], by which we draw nigh unto God.

[1] Ver. 11.—Instead of ἐπ' αὐτῇ, read after Sin. A. B. C. D*. E*. 17, 31, 46, ἐπ' αὐτῆς; and instead of the Pluperf. νενομοθέτητο, read after Sin. A. B. C. D*., 17, 47, 73, νενομοθέτηται.

[2] Ver. 14.—Instead of οὐδὲν περὶ ἱερωσύνης, read after A. B. C*. D*. E., 17, 47, περὶ ἱερέων οὐδέν. So also in Sin., excepting that there οὐδέν stood originally after Μωυσῆς, and has been placed before it by a later hand.

[3] Ver. 16.—Instead of σαρκικῆς, read with Sin. A. B. C. D*. L., σαρκίνης.

[4] Ver. 17.—Instead of μαρτυρεῖ, should be read with Sin. A. B. D*. E., 17, 31, μαρτυρεῖται.

[Ver. 11.—εἰ μὲν οὖν, *if to be sure now, if, indeed, therefore*, οὖν, looking back and linking the proposition in a general way with the preceding; the μέν looking *forward*, and implying that the writer has in his mind some *alternative* sentiment to that which immediately follows, and which would naturally be introduced by δέ, but which may be, as here, suppressed. The words μέν οὖν, do not affect in the slightest degree the construction or meaning of εἰ with its verb. Alford absurdly translates: "If again" as "the nearest English expression to εἰ μὲν οὖν." It could not well be more unfortunately rendered, unless possibly by *yea if*, by which Alford renders the same combination at ch. viii. 4, while the rendering of μὲν γάρ, ver. 18 of ch. vii., by *for moreover*, is equally regardless of the meaning of the particles, and the demands of the context. In the present case the author passes (ver. 11) from a consideration of the *personal greatness* of Melchisedek,—a greatness guaranteeing, by implication, the greatness of the priesthood in which his should find its antitype—to the points of superiority of the Melchisedek priesthood of Christ over the Levitical priesthood.—ἐπ' αὐτῆς, *on the basis of it*—νενομοθέτηται Perf. like δεδεκάτωται, ver. 9, *have had their legislation*, stand recorded as having received the law.—τίς ἔτι χρεία *what need any longer*; ἔτι, *logical* here, not temporal.—ἕτερον ἱερέα, *a different priest*, not merely ἄλλον, *another*, numerically.

Ver. 12.—μετατιθεμένης, *while it is undergoing a change* or *transfer*; not simply *being changed*=μετατεθείσης.

Ver. 13.—ἐφ' ὅν, *upon, in relation to whom*.—μετέσχηκεν, *hath participated in, hath shared in* (perf. not as ch. ii. 14, μετέσχεν); Eng. ver., *pertaineth to*.—οὐδεὶς προσέσχηκεν, *none hath given attendance*.

Ver. 14.—πρόδηλον γάρ, *for it is conspicuously evident*—ἀνατέταλκεν, *hath sprung* or *risen*, not *sprang*.—περὶ ἱερέων, *concerning priests*.

Ver. 15.—περισσότερον ἔτι κατάδηλόν ἐστι, *more abundantly still is it evident*, κατάδηλος, intensive of δῆλος, and περισσότερον, stronger than the simple comparative of κατάδηλος.—εἰ, *if*—*if it is the case that—and it is*; Eng. ver., *for that* which gives the meaning.—ἀνίσταται, *there ariseth*.

Ver. 16.—γέγονεν, *hath become*, *vis*, priest; Alford, *is appointed*; Eng. ver., *is made*.—ἀκαταλύτου, not exactly as Eng. ver., *endless*; but *not to be dissolved, indissoluble, indestructible*.

Ver. 19.—Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελεί., *for the law brought nothing to perfection*, should be in parenthesis, and ἐπεισαγωγή, *a bringing in upon*, or *in place of*, coördinated with ἀθέτησις as subject of γίνεται, as shown clearly both by the μέν and δέ, and the much greater clearness and elegance of the construction; "there takes place an abrogation on the one hand—and an introduction thereupon ἐπί)." Ebr. follows the Eng. ver. in its erroneous construction. Alf. constructs the sentence otherwise correctly, but (misunderstanding apparently a statement of HART. *Partikel.* II. 414) regards μέν as here used elliptically, and pointing to an understood contrast in the permanence of the ζωὴ ἀκατάλ. just mentioned. "It is hardly possible, even with the right construction of the sentence, to regard this μέν as answering to the δέ following ἐπεισαγωγή; its connection with the γάρ will not allow this. If this had been intended we should have expected the form of the sentence to be ἀθέτησις γὰρ γίνεται τῆς μὲν προαγούσης ἐντολῆς." No criticism could be more incorrect. There is not the slightest reason why μέν cannot stand with γάρ, and yet be followed by its corresponding δέ, unless it is impossible for a sentence to stand in the relation indicated by γάρ to a previous sentence, and yet itself be susceptible of a distribution of its members by a μὲν and δέ. We have in fact just such a construction at vers. 20, 21, and it is among the most natural and familiar in the language. And the construction proposed by Alf. as required in case the μέν and δέ here were in contrast, is totally wrong. The order of words which he has given would imply a contrast not between the abrogation of the preceding commandment and the introduction of a better hope, but a contrast between the abrogation of the preceding commandment on the one hand, and of something else on the other. The construction, as it stands, brings out, regularly and elegantly, the required antithesis. It might indeed have stood γίνεται γὰρ ἀθέτησις μὲν προαγούσης—ἐπεισαγ. δέ, and also in one or two other modes of arrangement; but no change is needed.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 11. If, indeed, now perfection were, *etc.*—Εἰ μὲν οὖν ἦν is the genuine Greek construction for a hypothetical proposition which denies the reality of the case supposed.* The οὖν does not refer back to ch. vi. 20 (De Wette, Bisping). The γάρ in the parenthetical clause refers to the obvious but unexpressed thought that one might be inclined to assume that perfection was brought about through the Levitical priesthood, inasmuch as this stood in reality in organic connection with the Mosaic law. The supposition that the sentiment merely is that the people received legal ordinances *regarding* the priesthood (Schlicht., Grot., Bl.), is contradicted not merely by the utter superfluousness of such a remark, but chiefly by the fact that it is only with verbs

* [The μὲν οὖν has nothing whatever to do with the character of the hypothetical construction. The words simply indicate, the one (οὖν) its logical relation to that which precedes, and the other (μέν) its connection with that which follows. The εἰ ἦν (all that belongs intrinsically to the construction) is indeed genuine Greek, for the protasis of a hypothetical proposition which *denies* the reality of the case supposed, but so it is equally for that of one which *admits* it. All turns upon the character of the *apodosis*. If the apodosis be an *Indicative past* with ἄν, the proposition *denies*; if any Ind. tense without ἄν, it *admits*. Thus εἰ ἦν τελείωσις, χρεία οὐκ ἂν ἦν would be; *if there were perfection, there would not be need*, but there was, or is, not. Εἰ τελείωσις ἦν, χρεία οὐκ ἦν would be: *if there was perfection there was no need*—and there *was* perfection.—K.].

of *speaking* that ἐπί with the Gen. stands in such a sense (BERNHADY, *Synt.*, p. 248). Many, as Seb. Schmidt, Rambach and others, have even explained it barely of rites and institutions pertaining to the τελείωσις. Clauses denoting necessity are commonly followed by the Inf. with μή (HART. *Partikellehre* II. 125). When, however, the negation refers not to the entire sentence, but, as here, to an individual portion of it, οὐ also occurs (MADVIG *Gr. Synt.*, § 205; KÜHN., § 214, Anm. 2). Luther makes λέγεσθαι depend on χρεία, and all that intervenes depend on λέγεσθαι. It is more easy and natural to make the two Infinitives, ἀνίστασθαι and λέγεσθαι coördinate with each other, and both dependent on χρεία. Ἕτερον emphasizes the diversity in *kind*.

VER. 12. **For if the priesthood is undergoing a change,** *etc.*—The γάρ refers not (as with Lün.) to the parenthetical clause, but introduces the *first* argument in support of the main idea of ver. 11, *viz.*, that the appointment of a Melchisedek priest, is incompatible with the assumption of the sufficiency and efficiency of the Levitical priesthood. Νόμος is neither to be restricted to the law of the priesthood (Bez., Grot., *etc.*), nor to the ceremonial law (Calv., à Lapide, Carpz., *etc.*). For although it is true that ver. 13 merely introduces the proof of the proposition of ver. 12, that the change of the law, there asserted as inseparable from the change of the priesthood, appears historically in the fact that *the Old Covenant itself predicts* the Melchisedek priest as a non-Aaronic and Levitical priest, while ver. 14 attaches to this the historical proof of the *fulfilment* of this prediction in the person of Jesus, and thus far the law spoken of *might be* the mere law of the priesthood; yet inasmuch as it has been previously stated that the Israelitish people had received their νόμον in organic connection with the institution of the priesthood, of course the *change* of law here referred to can by no means be regarded as a partial one. [Moll then regards ver. 13 as still lingering back in the realm of prophecy, and simply asserting that the person of whom the language of the prediction is uttered, *viz.*, "thou art a priest," *etc.*, *appears in the very fact of the prédiction* as belonging to another tribe, where none gave attendance at the altar; for if he was a Melchisedek priest, he could not be an Aaronic and Levitical priest, and therefore could not be of the tribe of Levi; and he then regards ver. 14 as coming down into the *actual historical life* of our Lord, and confirming the inference from prophecy by the well known testimony of fact. The main scope of the paragraph, he thinks, is to illustrate the cardinal idea of ver. 11, *viz.*, that the institution of the Melchisedek Priesthood of Christ is incompatible with the supposition of the competence of the Levitical priesthood to accomplish its intended work of perfection. This is shown, *first*, by the fact that the Old Testament itself, as shown by the prediction of Ps. cx., contemplated a transfer of the Levitical priesthood to another tribe—a transfer actually realized in the person of Jesus (12–14). *Secondly*, by the *essential difference* in the character of the Melchisedek Priesthood of Christ (15–17)—K.]. Ταῦτα, ver. 14, refers to the words of the Psalm, cx. 4. The Perfects μετέσχηκεν, προσέσχηκεν, ἀνατέταλκεν, point to the historical facts as now standing completed before the eye. Ἀφ' ἧς denotes the springing forth from the φυλή. Προσέχειν τινι= to give one's attention, or devote one's activity to a thing. The reading προσέστηκε in Erasmus is a Patristic gloss. The πρό in πρόδηλον is not *temporal* (Pierce), but strengthens the conception of a thing as lying open or conspicuous by the facts, while κατάδηλον in like manner emphasizes the reasonings of ver. 15.

VER. 15. **And it is still more abundantly evident,** *etc.*—Ebrard entirely erroneously supposes that the thing here asserted to be evident is the fact of our Lord's springing from Judah (ver. 14). Bisping, following Chrys. and others, supposes it to be the greatness of the difference between the Levitical and the New Testament priesthood. Klee, with Primas., Just., Rambach, *etc.*, supposes it to be the reality of the change of the priesthood. Delitzsch, with J. Cappell. and Bengel, regards it as the inefficiency of the Levitical priesthood; while Bleek, De Wette, Thol., Lün., find in it the statement that the change of the priesthood involves the change of the law. But this statement itself served merely as the *first* proof of the capital thought contained in ver. 11, *viz.*, that the appointment of a Melchisedek priest was incompatible with the efficiency of the Levitical priesthood, and was itself again substantiated by the fact of *the actual occurrence* of the change. The author now advances to the *second* proof of the same point, a proof in which is involved alike the insufficiency of the Levitical priesthood, and the greatness of the distinction between the Levitical and the New Testament priesthood. In the previous argument the stress was laid on the circumstance that with the change of the priesthood stood *actually* and as *matter of fact* connected a change of the Mosaic law. It is now laid on the *intrinsic idea and character* of a Melchisedek priest. A Melchisedek priest, *as such*, is the subject of the clause. Had the author had in mind *Jesus* personally, he would have personally designated the subject, of which the *predicate* would then be the priest of a *different character*. The greater clearness of this proof, however, lies in the fact that His birth from a different Israelitish tribe does not so much constitute the Messiah a ἕτερος ἱερεύς as his "likeness" to Melchisedek. This not merely places him in another τάξις of Priests, but gives him a priesthood *forever* (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα), and such a priesthood can alone work τελείωσις, comp. ver. 25.

[The passage vv. 11–16 is, as indicated by the great diversity of opinions regarding it, while easy enough to translate, among the most difficult in the Epistle to analyze so as to assure us that we have the precise scope and drift of the author. Some, as Lünemann, regard ver. 12, with its ratiocinative γάρ, as simply illustrating the parenthetical clause of ver. 11, a view which at first glance seems probable. Others, as Bleek, De Wette, Delitzsch, regard it as paving the way for what follows, and "laying down the ground why, not without urgent cause, the priesthood is changed" (De Wette), admitting at the same time that the parenthetical clause of ver. 11 has an important bearing on the illustration. Moll

considers the capital thought which the whole passage is designed to illustrate, to be the incompatibility of the institution of the Melchisedek priesthood, with the idea of the sufficiency and competence of the Levitical priesthood. Equally, perhaps still more diverse, are the views regarding the reference of the κατάδηλον, ver. 15. Let us follow a little the course of thought. The author passes, at ver. 11, from illustrating the *personal greatness* of Melchisedek—involving by implication, the superiority of his priesthood to that of Aaron, and *a fortiori* the superiority of that of which his was but a type, to the Aaronic—to the consideration of the relative claims of the two priesthoods themselves, *viz.*, the Levitical priesthood and the Melchisedek priesthood of Christ. The main ideas which he introduces, and which lie in the very nature and relations of the case, are the following: 1. That the Mosaic economy rested for its execution and effectiveness on the Levitical priesthood; the abrogation, therefore, of the latter involves an abrogation of the former. This abrogation he mildly calls a *transfer*. 2. That this abrogation of the priesthood and of its associated and superincumbent economy is already predicted in the Old Testament, (in the declaration of God, Thou art a priest forever, *etc.*), and that this prediction is actually realized in the well-known descent of Jesus Christ from the stock of Judah—a non-priestly tribe. 8. That the change of priesthood, and of course the superiority of the latter, consists even more in the *internal character* of the Melchisedek priesthood, as compared with the Levitical, than in the mere external fact of change. 4. That the *oath* which accompanied the inauguration of the Melchisedek priest marks its superiority. 5. That its superiority is also marked by its singleness, untransferableness, and perpetuity, in all which features it stands contrasted with the Levitical. These are the general ideas from ver. 11 to ver. 26, and it is only at two or three points, chiefly at vv. 12, 18, and 15, that the difficulty is found in tracing the precise thread of connection. Without feeling over confident, I think it is nearly as follows:

If, indeed, now (the *now* οὖν, linking it in a general way with what precedes, the μέν pointing to the suppressed affirmation, contrasted with the supposition as; if, indeed it were, *but it is not*) perfection were by the Levitical priesthood—and that priesthood was bound to make the law effective, for the legislation of Moses was based upon it—there were no need for another priest to be spoken of in prophecy as about to arise after the order of Melchisedek, and not after the order of Aaron. And that such a change would not take place without urgent cause is evident, for see how far-reaching it is. For when the priesthood is transferred, as in the prediction of the Psalm it is, it carries with it a transfer and an abrogation of the Law. And that such a transfer is made is clear; for he in regard to whom the language of this prediction is uttered, belongs to another tribe, of which none has ministered at the altar;—(Delitzsch considers that in this verse (ver. 18) the author has already descended from the region of prophecy to that of fulfilment. Moll regards him as still standing on the ground of the prophecy, and simply stating what the prophecy implies regarding the birth and tribal relations of the predicted priest. In favor of Moll's view is the indefinite ἐφ' ὃν λέγεται ταῦτα; in favor of that of Delitzsch are the definite statements with the perfect tense of the verb, which seem to point to actual historical facts. I concur on the whole with Delitzsch; Alford scarcely touches the question).—For it is a well-known historical fact, that our Lord hath sprung from Judah, to which tribe appertains no regular priesthood. From this fact now it is evident that that change of priesthood has taken place which brings change of law, *viz.*, the fact that the old priesthood belonged to a particular tribe, and that when it passes to another tribe, of course the Mosaic priesthood is subverted, and therefore the whole structure reared upon it falls to the ground; but it is still more abundantly evident from another fact, *viz.*, the *intrinsically different character* of this new priesthood, in that this priest arises *after the likeness of Melchisedek*—having those properties which this likeness would presuppose—who hath been made, *etc.* From this point the course of thought is easy. I thus do not regard the course of thought as carried out with strict logical precision. The author shows how great consequences depend on the overthrow of the Levitical priesthood—no less consequences than the abrogation of the whole law that rests upon it—shows how this transfer is actually made in the person of Jesus, and how still more vital and deep-reaching than the mere transfer, is the change in the intrinsic character of the Melchisedek priesthood itself. Here he has, as it were, drifted into the topic of the *superiority* of Christ's Melchisedek priesthood to the Aaronic, which he then farther illustrates by the matter of the oath, and the singleness and perpetuity of the Melchisedek priest as against the plurality and transitoriness of the Levitical priests.—K.].

VER. 16. **Who has been made not after the law,** *etc.*—By νόμος here Chrys., Calv., Beng., Böhme, Thol., and others, understand the Mosaic law, whose elements are collectively designated as a fleshly institution. But the expression κατὰ νόμον ἐντολῆς σαρκίνης in antithesis to κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου, requires certainly that we take νόμος as at Rom. vii. 21, 23 in the sense of *norm*. We are not, however, to infer from this that ἐντολὴ σαρκίνη is the special requisition of the Mosaic law regarding the Levitical priesthood (Lün.), and is so designated because it lays stress merely on outward, earthly things, which are liable to destruction, as on *lineal descent*, *etc.*, and installs only mortal men as priests (Theod., Grot., Bl., De Wette, *etc.*). Still less may we appeal to the fact that in later Greek the distinction between adj. ending in ικός and ινος is done away (Winer, Thol., *etc.*). For no New Testament writer could characterize the Mosaic law, whether taken as a whole or in any of its ordinances, as *fleshly*, inasmuch as they are collectively to be referred back to the will of God, and for this reason Paul expressly emphasizes the spiritual nature alike of the νόμος and of the ἐντολή, Rom. vii. 12, 14. Doubtless, indeed, the signification of *perishableness*, which Beng., Carpz., *etc.*, have found in σαρκικός, is possible for σάρκινος

(=made of flesh). Still I should prefer to refer the epithet to the qualities of externality, frailty and impotence, which belong to the nature of the σάρξ, and which are also at the same time predicated of the ritual and statutory character of the Mosaic law. It is this property of the law which I conceive to be expressed by ἐντολὴ σαρκίνη. To this corresponds the fact that it is not placed in contrast directly with the historic Jesus but with the ἕτερος ἱερεύς, which finds its realization in Him, whose characteristic, as shown by ver. 18, is drawn from the words of the Psalm. Any reference to the capacity of Christ to impart life to others (as supposed by Cam., Dorsch., Calov, *etc.*), is not for a moment to be assumed. As previously κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχ. was explained by κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα M., so here εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα is explained by κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου. The language then has not reference to the incarnation of Christ the Messiah, but to His appointment as Melchisedek priest in the presence of God, in the completeness and perfection of His personal life. He is also the subject of μαρτυρεῖται [so Alf.], which Bleek and others take impersonally. Ὅτι is the ὅτι of citation as ch. x. 8; xi. 18.

VER. 18. **For there becometh a doing away,** *etc.*—The author is showing that the thought expressed in vv. 15, 16 is contained in the passage of the Psalm. To this passage points the Pres. γίνεται, which belongs to the two clauses that are separated by the parenthesis. Some interpreters remove the parenthesis, erroneously and make v. 19 an independent sentence, either making ἐπεισαγωγή a predicate to ὁ νόμος, and supplying ἐστίν or ἦν (Erasm., Calv., Ebr., *etc.*), or making ἐπεισαγωγή subject and repeating ἐτελείωσεν (as Beza, Grot., E. Ver.). In the former case the meaning would be: "but the law is indeed, or was, an introduction to a better hope:" in the second case: "but the ἐπεισαγωγή, *etc.*, did bring in perfection." The latter construction would demand the article before ἐπεισαγ. as before νόμος, indicating the subject. The former is opposed alike by the fact that the μὲν γάρ without the corresponding δέ is not=*namely*, but only=*for to be sure, for at least*, (HART. *Partik.* II., 414), which is here entirely out of place, and that ἐπεισαγωγή is not=εἰσαγωγή, but denotes the introduction of something either as added to an object already existing, or as a substitute for it. This object is here προάγουσα ἐντολή, whose meaning is determined by the connection, for which reason the absence of the article does not *require* that the clause be taken as a general one (Schlicht., De Wette), while the use of ἐντολή as substantially equivalent to the Mosaic νόμος, would be adverse to it, (Primas., Chrys., Theod., Calv., Grot., *etc.*). The thought contained in the parenthesis (so rightly at first constructed by Luther, and erroneously changed in his later version), is weakened by changing the neut. οὐδέν into the masc. οὐδένα, (Chrys., Schlicht., Grot., Carpz., Bisp., *etc.*).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

From this passage Chr. Ferd. BAUR takes occasion ("Christianity and the Church of the three first centuries," p. 99), to maintain that our author holds an essentially different position from Paul, saying, "To the Apostle Paul Judaism is essentially law, while in the law again appears only its negative relation to Christianity. To the author of the Hebrews, Judaism is essentially a priesthood. The priesthood is with him the primary thing, and the starting point of his entire discussion; the law is but secondary. The latter must regulate itself by the former." It is only when torn from its connection that our passage can be so explained. It points rather to the historically known *fact*, that the Mosaic law, through which the Israelites in general were constituted a people, and especially a people of God, was given to them with direct reference to, and *on condition of the ministry of the priesthood*, which, in its establishment and functions, stood indissolubly connected with it. From this, then, could the conclusion be drawn, that the change of so *essential an institution* as the priesthood would include and draw after it the change of the law itself. If then, *farther*, as an historical fact it must be acknowledged, that in the Old Testament itself, by the divine word of prophecy, this change of the priesthood is announced as one *designed* by God, and with certainty to be introduced through the Messiah, there could be drawn the *farther* conclusion that the whole law and the legal covenant relation in general, has, in the plan of God himself, only a *transitory*, and as elsewhere indicated, disciplinary significance. The fact was thus demonstrated, that in the *establishment* of the Law, and of its institutions, God did not promise and pledge within the covenant of the law itself, and within its means of grace, the attainment of the demanded and designed *perfection*. Rather this perfection must and can be attained by other means of grace, which are in like manner announced by God, and have been already introduced.

2. The Law can, as the verbal expression of the Divine will, only *describe* perfection; it cannot exhibit it personally. It can further, as the command of God to His people, only *demand* from them human perfection, but not create it in them. Finally, as the law of the holy God, it cannot overlook the universal lack of perfection, nor leave those whose duty binds them to this perfection, exempt from punishment. It must rather judge the sin everywhere disclosed by it, and, since all men prove themselves to be sinners, can only condemn and not acquit. This is the imperfection and the weakness—*this incapacity to produce perfection*—which lies in the nature of law *as such*, and of course also in the *law of God;* comp. Rom. viii. 8; Gal. iv. 9, where Paul calls the law τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα.

3. Should, with this condition of things, a positive covenant relation between God and His people, bound solemnly to the law, be possible, this could only take place by instituting an expiation, upon the foundation of which rests *a reconciliation* for the forgiveness of sin, and the introduction of the spiritual peace and blessing, which we so deeply need. But since man as a sinner is incapacitated for it, his only hope rests upon the *Divine interposition* in providing such an expiation.

4. This divinely originated plan is not merely

promised by the word of prophecy, but was immediately, by a system of legal arrangements, by the institution of the Levitical priesthood, at once *prepared for and prefigured.* So far was it from lying within the divine purpose to introduce perfection by this institution, that on the one hand its typical and symbolical character was made clearly manifest, and on the other its transitory nature and import were expressly declared by the direct prediction of a priesthood of another character in the Old Testament itself, where the Messiah is purposely represented not merely as a priest-king, but also as not an Aaronic, but a Melchisedek Priest.

5. It is true that Christ is also the *antitype of the high-priest Aaron;* yet only in so far as His death on the cross, which wrought an eternal redemption, is compared with the annual expiatory sacrifice, which only the high-priest, after first making expiation for himself, was permitted to offer. But in respect, on the other hand, to the *origin* and *dignity* of the Son, who, forever perfected, sits enthroned at the right hand of the Father; in respect to that ministry of intercession and of blessing, which gives perpetual efficacy in heaven to the sacrifice which once for all was offered upon earth,—in respect to these He is the *counterpart of the Priestly King Melchisedek.*

6. In this relation Christ exercises *forever* His mediatorial function, because in His *person* He possesses an indestructible life. He is Priest, not in consequence of *any* commandment, or on the ground of any priestly descent, but *in virtue of His personality,* which renders Him the bearer of an eternal and untransferable priesthood, on the ground of His *offering of Himself* on the cross, *and in consequence of the position* which He assumes as the Risen, eternally living God-man, exalted above all heavens to the throne of God.

7. The *origin* of Jesus from the tribe of Judah (Rev. v. 5), through His descent from the house of David (Acts ii. 30; Rom. i. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 8), which is, on the one hand, like the rising of a star, Num. xxiv. 17, or of light from on high, Is. lx. 1; Mal. iii. 20; Luke i. 78; on the other, like the sprouting branch, Is. iv. 2; Jer. xxiii. 5; xxxiii. 15; Zech. iii. 8; vi. 12, shows that the priesthood of Jesus is not the Levitico-Aaronical, but the Melchisedek priesthood; that thus the change predicted in the Old Testament has already *historically taken place,* and with this the abrogation of the Mosaic law received its authorized beginning. In this connection the remark of the author that this birth of Jesus from Judah is a perfectly *well-known* fact, so that he can make of it as of an unquestionable foundation, the most decided use in addressing his readers, is of great historical importance, especially in view of the circumstance that this epistle was written before the destruction of Jerusalem.

8. In the old covenant the Levitical priests were the mediators between God and the people; they had the honorable appellation of "those who draw near to Jehovah," Num. x. 3. Since Christ entered on His office as the only and eternal mediator, the whole people of God have received the appellation of a royal priesthood; a free access to the Father has been opened to all believers, and *the realization of a better hope has commenced,* which in the Old Testament prophecy came from the Melchisedek priest to the law, and passed over, out of and beyond it.

9. Also the *hope* of the believers of the *Old Covenant* was not directed merely to earthly goods, to long life and possession of the promised land, to security from enemies, and to dominion over unbelievers. The hope of a future life was according to ch. xi. 10, 13, 14 by no means wanting to the Patriarchs, and the Messianic hope gave them not only a *concrete subject matter* of their hope, but led also to better *means for perfection* than the legal institutions could furnish.

10. The idea of *perfection* embraces all points and elements in that *state of perfectness* in which the Divinely appointed goal is reached, to which Christ was led by sufferings (ch. ii. 10), and to which man (x. 1) can attain only through this ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας on the ground of the sacrifice of this New Test. high-priest (x. 14). But this state is not with Reuss (*Hist. de la Theol. II.*, 551) to be limited to subjective and moral perfection. It rather has only its *beginning* in the purification which appertains to the conscience, ch. ix. 7; its *progress* in that *drawing near* to God (vii. 19), in which the outward objective principle of sanctification described in ch. x. 14, now proves itself actually efficacious; and its *conclusion* in eternal life, primarily in the spirits of just men made perfect, xii. 23, then after the resurrection, in their participation in glory, xi. 40.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The likeness and unlikeness of Christ to the priests of the law.—Wherein consists the strength, and wherein the weakness of the law? —The hope, by which we draw near to God, as already foretold in the Old Testament, by means of the old covenant, however, was not to be realized.—God changes not His plan, but does change sometimes the means of its accomplishment.—The glorious harmony of prophecy and history in the person of Jesus Christ.—How do law and Gospel stand related to each other?—The hope to which we are called: *a.* as to its substance; *b.* as to its foundation; *c.* as to its nurture.—Christ, a priest of a different kind from all other priests whatsoever.—Christ at once God and man, Priest and King, subject to the law, and free from its statutory observance.—The mutual relation of law and priesthood.

Starke:—The Old Testament, as one which in itself was much too weak, must necessarily be changed, and through the New Testament, a better hope be brought in, through the efficacious sacrifice and intercession of Jesus Christ, as the perfect high-priest, who alone gives us salvation. The Levitical Priesthood is fulfilled through the Messianic, and thereby has been done away. —The holy and wise God has in His word set forth, for the good of men, the mystery of Christ, in manifold ways, with so many reasons, of which some are at once clearer and more binding than others. —What the prophets have predicted of Christ so many hundred years ago, has been in Him so

exactly fulfilled. Who sees not also in this, the divinity of the Holy Scriptures?—While all believing Christians are permitted to draw near to God in Christ, they are also all spiritual priests, whose dignity and office it is to offer themselves in sacrifice to God, (Rom. xii. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9) as those who are animated with the Spirit of Christ, and adorned with the white priestly garment of righteousness, Is. lxi. 10.—Blessed is he who from time to time draws near in faith to Christ, and in Christ unto God, and makes his whole life nothing else than, as it were, a perpetual going out from himself and the world, and going in unto God, Jam. iv. 8.—He who, while he lives on earth, draws not near to God, in faith and prayer, will not come to God after death, ch. iv. 16.; Rom. v. 1, 2.

HAHN:—As Priest, Christ assists from within; creates an internal atmosphere, gives freedom and joy. As King, He aids also from without, and removes everything which can hinder the inner life of His people, and brings to naught the assaults of their foes.

RIEGER:—From the fact that another Priest was to appear, was to be inferred an entire change in the economy of God.

HEUBNER:—The present religion of the Jews is an exceedingly defective Judaism. They admit some of its elements, while what is most important in it, they are utterly unable to carry out.—All mysteries, orders, societies, which claim equal or even superior rank to the Church of Christ, are a sin against the high-priestly dignity of Christ.

STEIN:—Christianity is by so much the more perfect covenant, in that the covenant of God in the Old Testament, merely introduced, prepared for, and prefigured it; in that it then removes imperfections which the former was not able to remove; and finally, in that there are also blessed prospects for the future, which indicate Christianity as the more perfect covenant.

III.

The New Covenant is by so much the more excellent as Jesus Himself is its personal guarantee.

CHAPTER VII. 20–22.

20 And inasmuch as not without an oath [the swearing of an oath, *ὁρκωμοσία*] *was he*
21 *made priest:* (For those priests were made [for they indeed have become priests]
without an oath; but this [he] with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord
sware and will not repent, Thou *art* a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek:)[1]
22 By so much[2] [also] was Jesus made [hath Jesus also become] a surety of a better testament [covenant].

[1] Ver. 21.—The words *κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχ.*, are wanting in Cod. Sin., B. C., 17, 80. In the Sin. are wanting also the preceding words *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.*

[2] Ver. 22.—Instead of the Rec. *τοσοῦτον*, we are to read *τοσοῦτο* according to the Sin. A. B. C. D*. In the Sin. the *ν* has been added by a later hand, as also previously the words *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* as far as *Μελχ.*

[Ver. 20.—*ὁρκωμοσία, the swearing of an oath:* so the fuller form (like *μισθαποδοσία*, ii. 2) had better be rendered (with Alf.), than by the simple *oath* (ὅρκος, as vi. 17).

Ver. 21.—*οἱ μὲν γὰρ χωρὶς ὁρκωμ. εἰσὶν ἱερ. γεγ. for they indeed*—for while they, *without the swearing, etc., have become priests.* It is difficult to reproduce in English the force of the periphrastic *εἰσὶν γεγονότες, are having become*, bringing out more fully the two-fold idea of *becoming* and *continuance.* We cannot, perhaps, render better than simply *have become* as if it were *γέγονατε.*

Ver. 22.—*καὶ κρείττονος διαθ. γεγ. ἔγγυος Ἰης., also of a better covenant* (not *testament*), *hath Jesus become* (not, *been made*) surety.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 20. **And inasmuch as,** *etc.*—Luther translates erroneously, "and besides, what is much," from a misconception of the Vulgate *et quantum est.* He connects also, like Chrys., Theodoret, Erasm., Calv., *etc.*, these words with the preceding. True, the text in fact emphasizes the idea that this hope was not introduced without the swearing of an oath, but *in form* a protasis precedes to which the *κατὰ τοσοῦτο* corresponds, and in which we are not to supply *ἱερεὺς γέγονεν* (Œc., Beng., Böhme, Lün.), still less *ἔγγυος γέγονεν*, but, *γίνεται τοῦτο* (Bleek, De W., Thol., Hofm., Del.).

VER. 22. **Surety of a better covenant.**—Luther erroneously understands here *διαθήκη* as *testament*, and translates without authority *ἔγγυος*, *ausrichter*=executor. In classic Greek *διαθήκη* always denotes an *arrangement*, in general, a *disposition* or settlement, of which *will* or *testament* is a special form. The Sept., however, employs the word regularly instead of *συνθήκη*, as a trans-

lation of בְּרִית, so that it is also to be regarded in the New Testament as a *terminus dogmaticus* = covenant, from which signification we are to depart, only when compelled by the connection. The justification of this view of the word on the part of the LXX., and of the New Testament writers, lies in the fact that the covenant of God with men is not a compact concluded between two equally authorized and independent parties; but is essentially a Divine arrangement and disposition against sin and for human salvation, into which those who are called enter under a religious obligation, and to which God binds Himself in His truth and faithfulness. The Hebrew expression appears, on the contrary, to spring from this latter view, since for the word בָּרָה the signification "*determine, constitute, establish*," assumed by Hofm., cannot be proved, but only either the signification "separate, choose out," is admissible, 1 Sam. xvii. 8, or the signification "cut," with reference to the original mode of ratifying a covenant, to which Jehovah (Gen xv.), as matter of convenience condescends.—Ἔγγυος is not to be explained by μεσίτης, *mediator*, although this word (not found elsewhere in the New Testament) may have been selected with allusion to the preceding ἐγγίζειν. Moreover the strictly *juristic* conception of the term *fidejussor*, and a reference to Christ's *vicarious satisfaction* (Thom. Aquin., Calov, *etc.*), as well as any supposed reference to Christ's sufferings in general, as sealing the covenant (Bl., De W., Lün.) is against the context, which in Christ, the Everlasting One, exalted at the right hand of God, recognizes the voucher and guaranty for the eternal maintenance and validity of the covenant which He mediates.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The Levitical priests entered the priestly office by a simple *command;* Christ entered it by an arrangement confirmed with a Divine oath. In this lies an undoubted *pledge:* 1. for the fulfilment under the conduct of the Messiah, of the Divine promise; 2. for the exaltation of the New Covenant above the earlier one; 3. for its everlasting duration.

2. Jesus is the promised eternal *priestly king,* whose *personal* character, position and dignity, give to the covenant which He mediates a closely allied and corresponding preëminence.

3. In the very nature of a royal *command* in regard to an arrangement and institution whose perpetuity is not specially indicated, still less promised and pledged, lies already the possibility of the *reversing* of the command, of the annulling of the institution, of a change of the arrangement by the Ruler Himself, without His thereby of necessity becoming untruthful, unrighteous and untrustworthy, falling into contradiction with Himself, or throwing back into confusion the products of His own creative power.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Jesus Christ, the *mediator* of the New Covenant, is at the same time the pledge: *a.* of its everlasting continuance; *b.* of its divinely approved character; and *c.* of the perpetual accomplishment of its promises.—How the preëminence of the New Covenant over the Old is assured *a.* by the promise and *oath* of its author; *b.* by the person of its priestly mediator.—From the Old Testament itself we might infer the exaltation of the *Priest of the Promise* above the priests of the law, and above their service.—The *Promise* connects with one another Law and Gospel, and at the same time leads over from time into eternity.

STARKE:—As it was conceived and determined in the counsels of the adored Trinity, *so* in Christ Jesus has all been carried out that in Him all should become blessed, and whatever will *may* become blessed.

RIEGER:—From the *swearing of the oath* the Apostle justly infers the great earnestness, the weighty interest and the extraordinary pleasure with which God has entered into and sealed this His arrangement.—Elsewhere *he* swears who *undertakes* an office in order that persons may entrust to him their interests; but here He swears who *confers* the office in testimony of His high purposes, and of His unchangeable will.

IV.

Christ lives forever, and can therefore, in His unchangeable Priesthood, forever intercede in the presence of God on behalf of the redeemed.

CHAPTER VII. 23–25.

23 And they truly [indeed] were many priests [have more than one been made priests],
because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death [on account of their
24 being hindered by death from continuing]: But this *man* [he], because he continueth

25 forever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore [whence also] he is able also
[*om.* also] to save to the uttermost [completely, unto perfection, εἰς τὸ παντελές] them
that come unto God by him, seeing that he ever liveth to make intercession for them.

[1] Ver. 23.—Instead of γεγονότες ἱερεῖς, we are to read with A. C. D. E., ἱερεῖς γεγονότες. Yet the Sin. has the words in the order first named.

[Ver. 23.—Καὶ οἱ μέν, *and they indeed—and while they*—πλείονές εἰσιν, *etc.*, *have in larger numbers*, as more than one, *become priests*—διὰ τὸ θαν. κωλύεσθαι, *on account of their being hindered by death*, *etc.* If the finite verb is used it should be in the present, not "*were* not suffered."

Ver. 24.—Ὁ, δέ, *but he*, not, *but this man*—ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην, *hath his priesthood, not to be passed by*, hence *superceded*; or, perhaps, better (with reference to the active παραβαίνω, *go aside from*, *transgress*, *violate*, παράβασις, *transgression*, *violation*) *not to be transgressed* or *transcended*, *inviolate*.

Ver. 25.—Ὅθεν καί, *whence also.*—εἰς τὸ παντελές, *unto completion*, *completely*. πάντοτε ζῶν, *always living*.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 23. **And they indeed, as more than one,** *etc.*—The connection shows that this plurality of the priesthood is not to be conceived as *simultaneous* (Erasm. in Paraphr., Braun, Del. [but Del. only partially—K.]), but *successive*. The idea of Del. that the language points back to the act of inauguration and consecration at Ex. xxviii. 29, where Aaron is not for himself alone chosen and consecrated, but in connection with his sons, and that it is the *multiplicity* of the priests that insures the continuance of the priesthood, is at once without proof, and obscures the antithesis. So also of the interpretation of παραμένειν, favored by Del. of *continuance in the priesthood* (Œc., Grot., and others). It is not with the priests in general, but with the *high-priest*, that Christ is placed in contrast; and to παραμένειν corresponds the following μένειν. [But by no means necessarily in the same signification. I think Grot., Del., *etc.*, are clearly right. To make μένειν and παραμένειν identical in meaning makes an intolerable platitude: "they are hindered by death from remaining in life!" But the *change* of reference is both suggested by the change in the verbs (μένειν and παραμένειν) and gives to each an appropriate and beautiful force: 'They are hindered by death from abiding *in their priesthood*;' He on account of His abiding forever *in life*, hath His priesthood unchangeable. The necessity of giving to both verbs the same reference is only *apparent*. The real contrast is against it—K.].

Ver. 24. **Unchangeable.**—Ἀπαράβατος belongs to the later Greek, and with Theodor., Œc., Theoph., Erasm., is by most taken *actively* =*not passing over to another*, whence Este and Justiniani explain that the priests of the Catholic Church are not *successors*, but *vicarii et ministri Christi*. More accordant with usage is the *Passive* construction, *not to be passed beyond or overstepped*, hence *inviolable*, *unchangeable*.

Ver. 25. **To the uttermost**, completely, to the consummation.—Εἰς τὸ παντελές is erroneously referred by the Peshito, Vulg., Chrys., Luth., Calv., Schlicht., Grot., *etc.*, to *time*. Ὅθεν καί, *whence also*, shows that the declaration in this clause is to be regarded as the consequence, and indeed the natural consequence, of the statement of the clause just previous. [This seems hardly decisive against the reference of the adverbial clause to *time;* yet in the connection we can scarcely doubt that the reference is not to His saving *always*, or *forever*, but to His saving *completely*, those who come to God through Him. The *perpetuity* of His priesthood enables Him to *carry through* the salvation which He has commenced—K.].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. A further prerogative of the New Covenant lies in the *unchangeableness* of the Priesthood, attached to *one and the same person*, and by Him carried out *in the most perfect manner* forever. The ground of this lies in the fact that Christ tasted death indeed, but has also forever overcome it; and that to both these alike, to His sufferings and His victory, as He originally undertook and accomplished them on our behalf, so also in heaven He gives on our behalf perpetual validity and efficacy.

2. The eternally unchanging, high-priestly, and royal sway of the glorified Son of Man, is the cause of our perfect salvation, in that, by means of this, we, *reconciled*, draw near to God, and are kept in *perpetual* fellowship of *life* with God.

3. The Priesthood of Jesus Christ does not commence with His ministry in heaven. There rather, He, the eternally Living One, as antitype of the priestly-king, Melchisedek, gives entire completeness and efficacy (Rom. viii. 34) to the sacrifice which, as antitype of the *Aaronic* high-priest, He offered in His death upon the cross, by the sacrifice of Himself.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Salvation and blessedness are the grand aim of the Priesthood of Jesus Christ.—The Priesthood of Christ is not less efficacious than it is permanent and comprehensive.—*Nearness to God* is possible only through the Son, but through Him is ultimately enjoyed in blissful perfection.—Wherein lies, on the one hand, the *indispensableness*, on the other, the *imperishableness* of the Priesthood of Christ?—*In* what consists, *on* what rests, and *by* what means is effected, the *complete deliverance* of men through Jesus Christ?—Christ has in His Priesthood no *successor*, since He lives forever, and no *substitute*, because He Himself exercises His office perfectly and all-sufficiently.

Starke:—The exalted Jesus prays actually before the throne of His Heavenly Father, on behalf of men, in a way that is pleasing to Him, so long as the kingdom of grace continues, since He can still bring man to salvation.—True members of Christ evince their spiritual priesthood toward others, in the fact that they pray for them zealously, although not with the meritorious

supplication with which Christ pleads for us, yet still acceptably, and in a manner that is productive of blessing.—Priest, Bishop, and Prelate, all are nothing. Christ is the true Archbishop and Chief Shepherd, to whom all things minister, and through whom all are nurtured and live, physically, spiritually and eternally.

RIEGER:—The death of Jesus Christ was no hinderance to the continuance of His Priestly office and employment, rather was itself a part of it. That Christ lives forever, is not only a prerogative of this Living Person Himself, but is also a blessing for us. Many circumstances that contribute to my happiness may change, but this capital circumstance changes not: "He ever lives and makes intercession for us." Who would ever reach the destined goal, were there not such a priestly office and intercession ever exercised on our behalf in the Sanctuary of God?

HEUBNER:—Drawing near to God implies not merely coming to Him in prayer, but obtaining His grace on earth, and His heavenly kingdom hereafter.—Christ is not merely an intercessor on behalf of those who are to be made subjects of grace, but also on behalf of those already converted, in their state of moral weakness and infirmity.—All human dignities, institutions, schools, perish; the dignity and office of Christ are imperishable.

HAHN:—In heaven we are more regarded and cared for than we believe, and in the heart of the Father and of the Son there is much that is taking place on our behalf.

V.

As the sinless Son of God, Jesus Christ has once for all offered Himself in sacrifice for the sins of the world.

CHAPTER VII. 26-28.

26 For also [*om.* also] such an high priest [also] became[1] us, *who is* holy, harmless, undefiled, separate [having been separated] from sinners, and made [become] higher
27 than the heavens; who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once [for all], when he
28 offered up himself. For the law maketh [constitutes, *χαθίστησιν*] men high priests, which [who] have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, *maketh* the Son, who is [hath been] consecrated [perfected] for evermore.

[1] [Ver. 26.—Instead of the bare *ἔπρεπεν* we should read with A. B. D. E. *καὶ ἔπρεπεν*, although Sin. has not the *καὶ* [*καὶ* adds force and beauty to the clause, and is undoubtedly genuine. It is as if he said, "not only do we *have* such an high priest, but such an one *also became us*."—K].

[Ver. 26.—*Τοιοῦτος γάρ*. The clause is constructed with exquisite rhetorical beauty. In place of *τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἱερεύς* which would have sprung naturally from the preceding, the author, with reference to the following discussion, changes the noun to *ἀρχιερεύς*, and then skilfully throws this over to the end of the clause, where it takes the reader by surprise.—*ἄκακος* hardly *harmless* by which word our Eng. ver., also renders *ἀκέραιος*. The latter is properly *guileless*, the former, perhaps,=*void of malice*. 'Harmless' is certainly too negative a term.—*κεχαρισμένος*, *having been separated*, locally withdrawn, *from sinners*.—*γενόμενος*, not *made*, but *becoming*, *viz:* in His exaltation at God's right hand.

Ver. 27.—*καθ' ἡμέραν*, *day by day, daily*.—*ἀνενέγκας*, *by offering* up.

Ver. 28.—*ἀνθρώπους* emphatic, those who are mere *men*.—*υἱόν* him who is *Son*—the art. omitted as ch. i. 1., *τετελειωμένον*, *having been perfected*.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 26. **For such an high priest, also**, *etc.*—*Τοιοῦτος* refers back to the high-priest described in v. 25; *γάρ* finds the *reason* of His existence in His adaptedness to our needs; *καί* emphasizes the naturalness and justness of such a reference; and the following predicates *holy*, *etc.*, define the special traits of our Melchisedek High-priest: *Ὅσιος*, with the LXX., a common translation of חָסִיד, refers to one's relation toward God; *ἄκακος* to His relations toward men; *ἀμίαντος* to His personal unceasing fitness for priestly service; *κεχ. ἀπὸ τ. ἁμαρτ.* to His withdrawal from all disturbing contact with the wicked, John vii. 32–36; Is. liii. 8; not to His inward purity in His *outward* association with sinners during His earthly life (Ebr.); *ὑψηλ.*—*γενομ.* to that absolutely supraterrestrial, supramundane mode of existence which followed His exaltation.

Ver. 27.—**Who hath no daily need**, *etc.*—*Καθ' ἡμέραν*, *daily*, *day by day*, cannot mean "on a definite day in the course of the year," (Schlicht., Michael.), nor can it with *διαπαντός* be taken as indicating *annual repetition*=still ever and ever recurring, (Grot., Böhm., De W., Ebr.). It is supposed, therefore, with Calov, and the best older interpreters, by Bl., Thol., Lün., that the author, with his mind specially on the singleness and finality of *the sacrifice of Christ*, has in loose and inexact expression, blended

the priestly sacrifices in general with the grand high-priestly sacrifice on the annually recurring day of atonement. They point, in support of the assumption, to the fact that the high-priest was not merely empowered to take part in the daily burnt offering as often as he chose (*Mishn. Tract. Thamid* VII. 3) but that he made frequent use of this privilege, particularly on Sabbaths, new moons, and festal occasions, (JOSEPH. *Bell. Jud.* V. 5, 6), and that the same is true of the daily incense offerings, to which there was ascribed an *atoning* significancy, Lev. xvii. 11, 12; Num. xxxiii. 10, LXX. As this sacrifice would seem to have been originally offered morning and evening by Aaron in person, Ex. xxx. 7; and the author of our epistle goes back in various ways, to the original institutions which were intended to be binding on all the generations of Israel, Ex. xii. 14; xxx. 8, the words ἀνάγκην ἔχει may admit this explanation all the more, as already Sir. xlv. 14, 16, the sacrificial service is designated generally as the service of Aaron, and also PHILO (*Ed. Mang.* II. 321) calls the high-priest εὐχὰς καὶ θυσίας τελῶν καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν. Against Wieseler's assumption that this passage attests a rite existing merely in the Egyptian temple of Onias, we have the decisive fact that also in the *Jerus. Talmud*, tr. *Chagiga*, II. 4, and in the *Babyl. Talmud*, tr. *Pesachim*, 57 *a*, it is said of the high-priest that he offers daily sacrifice (DEL. *Talmud. Studien* XIII. in RUDELB. and GUER. *Zeitschr. für die luth. Theologie und Kirche*, 1860, IV. 593 ff.). In like manner we may observe that, according to Philo, I. 497, in the daily sacrifices the priests offered a meat-offering for themselves, and the sacrificial lamb for the people. In this the πρότερον and ἔπειτα standing in relation to the daily offering, may find an explanation. We shall thus be under no necessity of referring the language exclusively to the high-priestly *minhha, i. e.*, to the vegetable meat offering, which according to Lev. vi., 13–16, the high-priest has to offer from the day of his anointing, daily, morning and evening, and this not for the people, but as a matter of daily consecration for himself; and to lay the emphasis on the fact that this meat-offering is designated Sirach xlv. 14; Philo, i. 497, 26; II. 321, 38; JOSEPH. *Antt.* III. 10, 7, as a θυσία, and is also mentioned by ORIGEN (*Homil.* IV. *in Levit.*): See LUNDIUS *Jüd. Heiligth*, III. 9, § 19, more recently THALHOFER: '*The bloodless sacrifices of the Mosaic Ritual*,' p. 139–156. It may, however, well be urged that our author ch. v. 1, designates every sacrifice including the δῶρα in the narrower sense, as a sacrifice made in its ultimate ground and purpose, ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν. Only we must not deny that primarily the comparison of our passage with ch. v. 3, points certainly to a proper expiatory offering made by the high-priest περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, and that the sin-offerings *following in succession* suit no other day so well as the annual great day of atonement. The statements above made, however, show that we need not necessarily on this account yield our assent to the view of Hofmann (SCHRIFTB. II. 1, 287, 2 *Ausg.* II. 1, 404), as is done by Riehm, Alford, and Delitzsch in his commentary: "The comparison is not made between what Christ would have to do, and that which the high-priests have daily to do; but between that which the high-priests have to do, and that which Christ would have to do day by day. He would be obliged, inasmuch as ever new and perpetual expiation would be required, to do day by day that which he has now done once for all." Delitzsch remarks that this view is favored alike by the nicely chosen position of καθ' ἡμέραν, and by the plural expression ὥσπερ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς; but he has retracted his concurrence (RUDELBACH, *Zeitschrift*, 1860, IV. 595). Hofmann refers the τοῦτο ἐποίησεν to the whole expression πρότερον—λαοῦ, as also Schlicht., Grot., Hammond did, though with different special views, inasmuch as Hofmann regards as the antitype of the sin-offering presented by the High-priest περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, the supplication of Jesus in Gethsemane (ch. v. 7, 8); while against all use of language, Schlichting understands by ἁμαρτίαι Christ's *infirmitates et perpessiones*, Grotius understands by it the *dolores* assumed and submitted to by Christ as punishment for the sins of humanity, from which *dolores* He was only set free by death. Delitzsch, however, with the majority, refers it to the high-priestly θυσίας ἀναφέρειν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ. The γάρ v. 28 introduces the reason, as lying in the fact of the case, for the above-mentioned relation of Christ to the Mosaic priests.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The death of Jesus Christ on the cross is in its essential significance to be conceived as a *voluntary* self-sacrifice, corresponding to the *purpose* of God, yet not barely in the sense of a moral offering for the benefit of others, but as a *vicarious sacrifice, expiating* the *guilt of sin* for collective humanity, taking away the *punishment of sin*, and working *reconciliation* with God.

2. Its *fitness* for such a work this death derives from *the character of* the person, who is at the same time priest and victim, and unites in himself, and possesses in their truth and reality, all qualities which in the Levitical service are divided between priest and victim, and which there have but a mere symbolical efficacy.

3. The *nature* of this self-sacrifice of Christ excludes the continuance of the symbolico-typical priesthood and sacrificial service, just as its eternal validity and efficacy admits no *repetition* of this perfect sacrifice, and no *substitution*, or the offering of any other sacrifice of like dignity and importance with the Son, who is perfected forever.

4. The weakness which inheres in mortals is partly a *creaturely limitation*, partly an *inborn sinfulness*, partly a *personal guiltiness*. From this springs the partial nature of the legal high-priesthood, its purely symbolical significance, and the necessity of a *plurality* of persons relieving one another, and of actions which repeat themselves with special mutually supplementary acts. But within the Old Testament revelation itself, the promise of God, confirmed by His oath, points to the *universal* character, to the *reality* and to the *efficacy* of the atonement accomplished by the eternally perfected Son.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

1. The character of the Priesthood of Jesus Christ, in its dependence on the nature of the person of the Lord.—The sole and single high-priesthood of Jesus Christ, corresponds perfectly to the necessities of the human race, and to the revealed purpose and will of God.—The weakness of men and the eternal perfection of the Son.—Christ at the same time priest and victim.—The causes of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ are: *a.* the sin of the world; *b.* the purpose of God; *c.* the loving obedience of the Son.—The effects of the offering of Jesus Christ by Himself: *a.* on the perfection of His own person; *b.* on the relation of the world to God; *c.* on the character of the priesthood exercised by man.—Wherein consists the preëminence of the high-priesthood of Jesus Christ?

Starke:—Preachers bear their treasures in earthen vessels. When they err let none be stumbled thereat; they are obliged also for themselves to bring the offering of repentance.—Christ has made an offering once for all; by this we should and must abide; and thus it is to depreciate His sacrifice, to desire still daily to offer it as Popish priests assume and undertake to do.—The sacrifice of Christ made once for all, serves us, as for the strengthening of our faith, so also for the cleansing of our walk, that we may abide therein and not draw back.—Behold the ground of the efficacy and perfection of the single and final propitiatory sacrifice of Christ; He is the Son of God whom the Father hath raised from the dead, received into His glory, and placed at the right hand of His majesty.

Rieger:—The depth of our need, and the loftiness of the purposes for which God has commenced His dealings with us, demanded such a High-priest as God in this One has prepared for us.—Such a high-priest was necessary for us, who, with the purest zeal for the honor of God, could still in a becoming manner lead to Him a world full of sinners.—Jesus has shown satisfactorily that He is at once a true friend of sinners, and from the heart an enemy of sin.

Heubner:—The ground of the priestly dignity of Christ lies in His innocence, righteousness and holiness.—The repetition of sacrifices was a constant reminder of the weakness and sinfulness of men.

Menken:—Holiness in feeling and in conduct the Scripture ascribes to mortal men while they live in the flesh and on the earth, as it also demands of believers and righteous men, that they shall cherish in their heart, and evince in their life, holiness, not merely in the future but also in the present world. But it styles no mortal man *perfect.*

THIRD SECTION.

THIS PRIESTHOOD CHRIST ACCOMPLISHES, AS HEAVENLY KING AND MEDIATOR OF THE NEW COVENANT, A COVENANT PREDICTED IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

I.

As High-priest of the true sanctuary which God reared and not man, Christ hath taken His seat at the right hand of Majesty in the heavens.

Chapter VIII. 1–5.

Now of the things which we have [are being] spoken *this is* the sum [chief point]:
We have such a high priest, who is set [took his seat, ἐκάθισεν] on the right hand of
2 the throne of the [*om.* the] Majesty in the heavens; A minister of the sanctuary, and
3 of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and [*om.* and][1] not [a] man. For every
high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices; wherefore *it is* of necessity that
4 [also] this man [one] have somewhat also [*om.* also] to offer. For if [indeed,
μέν][2] he were on earth, he should [would] not [even, οὐδέ] be a priest, seeing that there
5 are priests [those][3] that offer gifts according to the law: Who serve unto the example
[as those who minister to a copy] and shadow of [the] heavenly things, [according] as
Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make [complete, ἐπιτελεῖν] the
tabernacle: for See, saith he, *that* thou make[4] all things according to the pattern
shewed to thee in the mount.

[1] Ver. 2.—*Καί* is to be expunged after Sin. B. D*. E*., 17.

[2] Ver. 4.—Instead of *εἰ μὲν γάρ*, should be read with Sin. A. B. D*., 17, 73, 80, 137, *εἰ μὲν οὖν*. [Tisch. retains *εἰ μὲν γάρ*, which seems to me much more accordant with the connection. The substitution of *οὖν* for *γάρ*, though strongly supported and favored by most modern editors, I cannot but regard as the result of a misunderstanding of the connection.—K.].

[3] Ver. 4.—The words *τῶν ἱερέων* before *τῶν προσφερόντων*, are not found in Sin. A. B. D*. E*., 17, 73, 137, and are to be regarded as a gloss, which Grotius, Mill, and Griesbach were inclined to expunge. The Art. before *νόμον* is wanting in Sin. A. B., 57, 80.

[4] Ver. 5.—Instead of *ποιήσῃς*, all the best authorities require us to read *ποιήσεις*.

[Ver. 1.—*Κεφάλαιον δέ*, *and as a capital point*, not the "sum;" for he is not summing up the preceding, but advancing to a new discussion.—*ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις*, *over*, *respecting the things which are being said*—the points under discussion; not *over the things which we have spoken* (as if summing up what had been said) which would require *τοῖς εἰρημένοις*.—*ἐκάθισεν*, *sat down*, *took his seat*.

Ver. 2.—*ἀληθινῆς*, *true—genuine*, *archetypal*, not the shadow or copy.

Ver. 3.—*εἰς τὸ προσφέρειν*, *for the offering*, *in order to offer*.—*ὅθεν ἀναγκαῖον*, *whence* (not, *wherefore*) *it is*, or *was necessary*.—*καὶ τοῦτον*, *also this*, scil., high-priest.

Ver. 4.—*Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν*, *for if indeed he were* much better, in my judgment, than the reading *εἰ μὲν οὖν*, *if, indeed, now*.—*οὐδ' ἂν ἦν ἱερεύς*, *not even would he be a priest;* no emphasis on *ἱερεύς*, as contrasted with *ἀρχιερεύς*, but the *οὐδέ* emphasizes *ἦν*, *not even would he be*.—*ὄντων τῶν προσφερόντων*, *there being*—inasmuch as there are, *those who are offering*.

Ver. 5.—*οἵτινες*, characteristic, *as those who*.—*ὑποδείγματι*, *to a copy;* sometimes *ὑποδειγ.*=*pattern*. *Ὑπόδειγμα*, *a thing shown under*, *i. e.*, in subserviency to, something else whether as *model* or *copy*—*τῶν ἐπουρανίων*, *of the heavenly*, scil., *πραγμάτων*, *things*, or, as I think, better, *ἁγίων*, *sanctuary*—*καθὼς κεχρημάτισται*, *according as Moses has been divinely instructed*.—*μέλλων ἐπιτελεῖν*, *being about to accomplish*, hence, *complete*, *carry through the construction of*.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. A capital point in respect of the things which we are saying.—As the author comes now to a point not hitherto specially treated, and proceeds to a comparison between the priests who serve in the *Mosaic tabernacle*, and Christ, the royal Priest who ministers in heaven as the true sanctuary, *κεφάλαιον* must here denote not the "sum" (Erasm., Luth., Calv., *etc.*), but "chief or capital point." The appended *ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομ.* too, excludes the idea of a *summing up* or recapitulation of a previous discussion, as this would demand the form *κεφ. τῶν εἰρημένων*, 'sum of what *has been* said.' The *present* part. shows also that the author is not introducing a fresh topic *additional to the preceding* (Calov, *etc.*), but simply bringing out into fuller notice and development, with reference to the special character of his readers, the chief and central point *of the existing discussion*. This cardinal point is the determining of the *quality* of our High-Priest Christ, who, as the Messiah seated at the right hand of God, can only minister in the sanctuary of which that of Moses is to be regarded as the earthly copy. Hence, ver. 2 is, without a comma, to be united with ver. 1. It is indifferent for the sense whether the words commencing the chapter are taken as Acc. absolute, or as an anticipatory nominative apposition to the entire following clause. The explanation of Hofmann, who puts a colon after *κεφ. δέ*, is wholly erroneous: (in addition to those who were called high-priests we have," *etc.*).

Ver. 2. As minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle.—The Adj. *ἀληθινῆς* is commonly, by Zeugma, referred also to *ἁγίων*. But we have thus either a tautology, or a difficulty in distinguishing *ἁγίων* and *σκηνῆς*, if the former word be regarded as neuter. The distinction drawn by Chr. F. Schmid, who makes *τὰ ἅγια* denote *the whole temple*, and *σκηνή* the *holiest of all*, is entirely arbitrary. The reverse distinction would be much more in accordance with the general usage of the author, who uniformly, except ch. ix. 3, designates the *holiest of all* by the simple *ἅγια*. But why thus distinguish the part from the whole, if this part again is to be included in the whole? We should rather infer that the *σκηνή* could also designate only a part of the entire sanctuary, and of course the part separated from the 'holiest of all,' which ch. ix. 2 is called *σκηνὴ ἡ πρώτη*. But what *application* shall we make of this distinction? According to Del. *τὰ ἅγια* would seem to designate the throne of God situated above and beyond all the heavens, the eternal *δόξα* of God Himself, into which Christ has entered, and where He appears as mediator on our behalf; but *σκηνή*, the heaven of angels and of all the blessed saints, where Christ rules with mediatorial sway. This view is refuted—to say nothing of other objections—by the very language of our passage, in which Christ, as minister *τῶν ἁγίων*, has taken His seat at the right hand of the throne of Majesty *in the heavens*. Few, however, will be inclined, with Hofm. (*Weiss.* II. 189 ff.; *Schriftbeweis* II. 1, 405), to understand, after Beza, Gerhard, *etc.*, by *σκηνή*, *the glorified body of Christ*, or in a broader sense, after Calov, Braun, *etc.*, *the Christian church*. It were more natural to refer *τὰ ἅγια*, though not with Seb. Schmidt, Braun, Rambach, to the *employments and utensils* required for the priestly service, yet, with Luth. and others, to the holy and true goods and *possessions*. But this explanation is discountenanced alike by the word *σκηνή* and the word *λειτουργός*, which latter in this connection, instead of its original signification of *a public officer* acting for the good of the people, has, doubtless, in accordance with the usage of the Sept. a special relation to the position and office of *priest*. If now we abandon the idea of a *zeugma* in the construction, we shall still not be obliged, either with Hofm., to resort to the unnatural construction of *ἐν τοῖς οὐράνοις* with *τῶν ἁγ. λειτουργός*, nor to retain, with Primas. and Œcum., the masc. construction of *τῶν ἁγίων*, a construction illy harmonizing with the designation of Christ as *λειτουργός*. We need but take *καί* EXPLICATIVELY, and all difficulty vanishes.

[The last sentence undoubtedly suggests the true solution of this much vexed question. The term *ἅγια*, *holy place*, *sanctuary*, is first naturally used with reference to the character and use of the tabernacle as consecrated to God, and a place of religious and priestly service. The word *σκηνή* is then added to designate the *structure*, and to bring it into more distinct relation to the tabernacle of Moses. The added *καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἀληθ.* is then a sort of loose synonyme or fuller statement of the idea conveyed by the *τὰ ἅγια*. Delitzsch's notion, that the *ἡ σκηνή* is the

heaven of the glorified saints, and Hofmann's that it is the glorified body of Christ, are both utterly unfounded conceits—that of Hofmann preëminently so; while the view of Alford, which undertakes to combine the two, with a preponderance in favor of Hofmann's, labors under the double difficulty of adopting two views, both of which are alike without support in the Epistle, and without a particle of intrinsic probability, and which are also irreconcilable with each other. Every interpretation that undertakes to carry into the heaven of the New Testament the distinction between the inner and the outer sanctuary of the Mosaic tabernacle, ignores the very fundamental idea of that distinction, and leads to inextricable difficulties in interpretation, as has been illustrated in the numerous hypotheses, purely conceits, which the attempt to fix the nature of that heavenly outer tabernacle has originated. And if it be urged that the Mosaic tabernacle was itself but the copy of the heavenly tabernacle, and that, therefore, the antitype *must* have the same divisions as are found in the pattern, I reply that this is pressing unduly the figurative language of the author. The real actual pattern of the Mosaic tabernacle was that which God showed to Moses in Mount Sinai, an exact model after which he was to construct his earthly material tabernacle, and nothing more. Now that the author again should make a figurative application of that literal language, need not surprise, and should not mislead us. Literally that tabernacle was modelled precisely after the pattern or the direction which God had given Moses in the mount. Figuratively that tabernacle becomes a copy or type of the heavenly tabernacle or sanctuary, inasmuch as the high-priest ministering there in a symbolical expiation and removal of sin, typifies the heavenly High-priest officiating on high in a real expiation and forgiveness of sins. But that we are thence to carry *all* the special features of the earthly tabernacle into the figurative, heavenly New Testament tabernacle, does not follow; and is in fact impossible. For the essential characteristic of the outer tabernacle as distinguished from the inner—the very thing which it denoted was, as we shall subsequently see, *separation from God*. The veil of the temple, answering to the veil of the tabernacle, was rent at the death of the Son of God. The separation between outer and inner tabernacle, was done away—never to be renewed.—K.].—"Ἀληθής excludes the *untrue* and *unreal*, ἀληθινός excludes that which does not correspond to its idea. The measure of the ἀληθής is the *actual*, the measure of the ἀληθινός is the *ideal*. In ἀληθής the idea corresponds to the object, in ἀληθινός the object corresponds to the idea" (KAHNIS *Eucharist*, p. 119). For a parallel in *thought* see *Wisd.* ix. 8.

VER. 3. **For every high-priest,** *etc.*—Many expositors take ver. 3, which Camer., Beng., *etc.*, enclose in a parenthesis as an incidental remark, unnecessary to the connection (Michael.), or disturbing the train of thought (De W.), or introducing a train of ideas that is again crowded out by others (Thol.), or merely explanatory of the word λειτουργός (Lün.). But the purpose of the author is not to show that Christ must be a *Priest of sacrifice.* Since the λειτουργεῖν or dealing in sacrifices is essential to the function of *every* high-priest (Lün.); he rather proceeds to prove that the λειτουργία of Christ can be exercised only in a *heavenly sanctuary*, which corresponds to the idea of the sanctuary that in type and figure was presented in the Mosaic tabernacle. It was already demonstrated from Scripture, that the Messiah is appointed of God to be alike King and Priest. As High-priest He must necessarily have *somewhat that he may offer.* In what this consists, remains as yet unstated, and it is a purely arbitrary and embarrassing hypothesis, which limits λειτουργεῖν and προσφέρειν exclusively to offering *sacrifices.* We are but pointed (as already observed by Justiniani, Este., *etc.*) to the necessity of *priestly functions and acts to be accomplished by Christ.* But in the legal economy where the *Levitical* priests have their function, there was absolutely no place for the priesthood of Christ; He needs, consequently, for the exercise of His priestly vocation, a heavenly sanctuary; and one which fulfils the entire *idea* of a sanctuary. Hence we are to supply with ἀναγκαῖον not ἦν (Peshito, Bez., Beng., Bl., De W., Lün.), but ἐστίν (Vulg., Luth., Calv., *etc.*), and to refer the προσφέρειν *not* to the sacrifice, offered once for all, of the body of Christ on the cross. The Aor. requires neither that we translate with Lün.: "for which reason it was necessary that also this one should have something which he *might* offer;" nor with Hofm.: "for which reason it is necessary that he have something which he *may have* offered." To read ᾧ=*where* for ὃ is totally unnecessary.

[I cannot but conceive that the true connection of the thought in ver. 3 has escaped nearly, or quite all the interpreters. That many of them have failed to detect it, is certain from the diversity of their explanations. Some, with Bengel, would put it in parenthesis. Michaelis regards it as entirely unessential to the connection; De Wette, as a disturbing intruder; Tholuck as turning to a thought that was again crowded out by others; Lünemann as added to explain the import of λειτουργός; Alford, after Delitzsch, as belonging here only incidentally; while Moll regards it as simply a *general statement* of the high-priestly function of Christ as introductory to the proof that He is ministering in a heavenly tabernacle. In this general and wide diversity of views, all but one *must be*, and all may be, wrong. The following may perhaps only increase by one the number of opinions to be rejected. I think, however, that it will be found that a close analysis will sustain the view that the passage is neither parenthetical, nor irrelevant, nor incidental, but introduces the grand thought which forms the theme of discussion through this and the following chapter, and that in fact this states, and states in its proper place, what is the vital point of the whole Epistle. Christ's Melchisedek Priesthood has been previously considered; now comes the consideration of His Aaronic *high*-priesthood. This is vital to the subject; for His mere Melchisedek priesthood, however intrinsically majestic and glorious, would be of no avail to sinners; He must minister in the heavenly sanctuary as the counterpart of Aaron, the Levitical high-priest, and, as such, in correspondence with this relation, *He must have*

something to offer. What this is, is the point now to be stated, and of which the author *only apparently* loses sight, the point toward which he pursues a constant though somewhat indirect course from this to ch. ix. ver. 11. Let us follow the course of thought. So important is it that He have something to offer, that if He were on earth, He could not even be a priest, inasmuch as there there is a regularly ordained priesthood for all the offerings of the Mosaic law, and which cannot *there* be superceded. But in fact He *has* a Priesthood in the heavenly tabernacle, and a Priesthood as much superior to the Levitical as the Covenant which He guarantees is superior to that under which they served. This leads to a natural digression—a digression from the immediate point under discussion, but standing in intimate vital connection with the general theme of the Epistle—in illustrating the superiority of the New Covenant, of which Christ was High-priestly Mediator and surety, over that Old Covenant of which the Levitical priests were servants. This illustration is effected by the apposite and beautiful citation from Jeremiah, which unfolds the *better promises* that characterize the New Covenant. This topic finished, the author resumes with ch. ix. the inquiry, *what* the New Testament High-Priest has to offer. He recurs, therefore, to the arrangements of that Old Covenant, whose high-priestly service was typical of that of the New. He naturally goes back to the tabernacle in which that service was performed ("to the first Covenant now there belonged," *etc.*), dwells somewhat minutely on its features (in order, by delineating its majesty, to enhance the glory of the Covenant which it but symbolizes), and then adds the facts to which all this description is but introductory, *viz.*, that while the ordinary priests enter daily into the outer sanctuary, into the inner the high-priest enters but once a year, alone, and *not without blood.* Thus we are prepared for the statement at ver. 11, to which all this has tended, *viz.*, that Christ must enter the heavenly tabernacle also with *blood,* and here the author reaches the point which he had in mind at viii. 3, and which he has not since lost sight of. If this analysis be correct, it will be seen that Moll's general division of the Epistle, which makes ch. ix. commence a new capital section, is vicious, inasmuch as it *cuts right in two* a chain of argument whose links are most closely connected. The same is true of Ebrard's analysis, who begins, as it were, a new and independent section with the description of the Mosaic tabernacle, and neither Delitzsch nor Alford has made any improvement on them. In fact, this description of the Mosaic tabernacle, ch. ix., is merely incidental, or rather a subordinate link in a chain of reasoning by which the author is showing what the New Testament High-priest has to offer. Thus ver. 3 of ch. viii. formally introduces the topic around which the whole discussion turns from this point to ch. x. 19, where, in reality, the grand *argument* of the Epistle terminates.—K.].

Ver. 4. **For if to be sure** [*εἰ μὲν γάρ*] **he were on earth.**—*Εἰ ἦν* cannot here mean "if he had been" (Böhme, Kuinoel; nor is any thing to be supplied, as *e. g.*, either *μόνον*, Grot., *etc.*), or *ἱερεύς* (Zeger, Beng., Carpz, *etc.*). The *οὐδέ* belongs to *ἦν*, not to *ἱερεύς*. Had the author intended to say that in the case supposed Christ could not be even a *priest*, much less a *high-priest*, (Bl., Bisp., Hofm.), he would have written *οὐδ' ἱερεὺς ἂν ἦν.*

Ver. 5. **As those who minister to a copy and shadow of the heavenly.**—*Λατρεύειν* stands indeed commonly with the Dat. of the *person* whom one serves, yet is found also with the Dat. of the thing in which (not *with* which) one serves, as also ch. xiii. 10. The proper signification of *ὑπόδειγμα* is that of an embodying, representative image; for which reason the word can be used, ch. iv. 11, as=*παράδειγμα*, *example, model,* and here as at ch. ix. 23, and more usually, denotes *copy,* with the subordinate idea of an outline simply drawn from memory. *Σκιά*, *shadow,* may stand in antithesis to *σῶμα*, *body* (as at Col. ii. 17), in which case it simply opposes the *non-essential* to the essence; or in antithesis to *εἰκών* (as ch. x. 1), in which case it suggests to the imagination the *obscurity* of the shadowy image. With *τῶν οὐρανίων* we need not, with Lünemann, supply *ἁγίων*; for the following chapters show clearly that not heavenly localities, but *heavenly relations and Divine ideas,* as realized in Christ, are regarded as the archetype symbolized by the Mosaic sanctuary: [so Alford: "the things in heaven, in the heavenly sanctuary." But the author, though treating of heavenly facts, relations, *etc.*, yet does it under the imagery drawn from the earthly tabernacle. He has already employed that imagery, transferring to heaven the figure of the tabernacle (ver. 2), and to this he ever and anon returns (ch. ix. 24), and in view especially of this passage just referred to, I incline to adopt Lünemann's view. This, of course, need not prejudice the fact that the thing essentially aimed at is ideas and relations.—K.]. So also Ex. xxv. 40. We need not assume an actual temple as archetype of the tabernacle which Moses from Sinai may be supposed to have beheld, standing in heaven, nor any original structure which God Himself had reared as a model upon Sinai, where, according to the later Rabbins, it was to stand forever, but a *pattern structure,* which was shown to Moses in prophetic vision, and is described in the words of God, Ex. xxvi. 26–30. This signification, *model building,* the word תַּבְנִית (which Josh. xxii. 28 denotes architecture, Deut. iv. 17, denotes sculpture of every kind, and Ps. cxliv. 12 points to a plastic model), will very well bear at Ex. xxv. 40. But it by no means accords with the prophetic survey of a model building which expresses heavenly relations, to assume, with Ebrard, a mere drawing or outline edifice, although such a drawing might in itself apply to the word in question according to 2 Chron. xvi. 10, where it signifies *sketch, outline,* and 1 Chron. xxviii. 11 ff., where it signifies *ground plot.* The typical signification comes out strongly at Isaiah xliv. 13, inasmuch as there, at ver. 14, the wood is to be sought for the carrying out and realization of the pattern structure given in ver. 13.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. After Christ, as High-Priest, had given His life as an expiatory offering on the cross, and with His atoning blood had entered into the inner sanctuary of heaven, He has not returned again from heaven to earth, as the Levitical high-priest was obliged, after completing the sprinkling of blood, again to quit the inner Sanctuary. The office and function of the Levitical priests suffices not as a type of Christ's work of reconciliation, and of His mediatorial position. Christ is *a Priest of a different description*, and for this has Melchisedek for His type. In this comparison, the capital point is, the recognition of the fact that Christ is a *royal Priest in heaven*, *i. e.*, after His elevation to the right hand of Majesty *ceases not to exercise priestly sway*.

2. Since the Melchisedek priesthood is of a different order from the Levitico-Aaronical, this cannot refer to an *offering of Christ in heaven*, but only to a *Priestly function*, by which the High-Priestly sacrifice that was previously, and once for all, offered upon the cross, is rendered *prevalent* with God, *efficacious* with respect to men. Yet this priestly function in *making intercession* and in *bestowing blessings*, Christ exercises as a *High-Priest* who sits upon the Throne of God, *i. e.*, on the ground of His sacrificial death upon the cross, and by virtue of His position as glorified God-man. "The blood of Christ has indeed been, in His sacrifice, poured out upon the earth, and so been separated from the sacrificial body, as was done with animals in the typical sacrifice. But still it behooved that it should not barely be sprinkled upon the earth, but be borne to the sanctuary of God to sprinkle the throne of grace. And after it has been once borne in thither, and sprinkled in a divine way, it belongs now to the office of our High-Priest whom we have in the sanctuary, to sprinkle it also upon our hearts and consciences, and this life of ours, still, indeed, having its source in blood, but not in the love of God, again to unite with the true life of Divine love." (Steinhofer).

3. Since, according to the Scriptures, the Priesthood belongs essentially to the Messiah, He must necessarily *always* exercise *Priestly functions* of essential significance; but it thence by no means follows that He must be conceived as in an act of *perpetual sacrifice*, as those do who understand by the heavenly offering either the person of the glorified God-man, and thence deduce the sacrifice of mass (as still recently Thalhofer) or regard the believers of all generations as the sacrificial offering of Christ to God, (Theodor. Mops., Chrys., Cyrill. Alex.). Nor even does it follow that in the offering which He makes we need specially think of *blood*. (Del.). Since if we, with justice, distinguish this act from the slaying of the victim, and in a detailed comparison of Christ with the Aaronic high-priests, as chaps. 9 and 10, refer the slaying specially to the crucifixion, and the *offering* to the sprinkling of the throne of God with the sacrificial blood, we must still, in the case of the expiation wrought in the death of Christ, refrain from pushing too far the points of comparison; and particularly we must not forget that these acts immediately followed one another on the day of atonement, belong, in fact, inseparably together, and work in the objective sense an expiation which is essentially distinguished from the reconciliation which is to be obtained by the subject only on this ground, and in consequence of this. In this relation the offering of Christ by His sacrifice of Himself on the cross, is an offering *once for all*, whereby He has effected *an eternal redemption*.

4. But to the priestly functions there belongs also a *sanctuary*. The earthly sanctuary, however, built by human hands, cannot be that in which Christ has His Priesthood. There, men minister who are from a stock to which Jesus, who is Christ, does not belong. Moreover, this sanctuary in its very erection was already designated as a mere copy. There must thus be a *heavenly* sanctuary, to which the Messianic priestly king belongs, and in which he exercises a priestly office. All endeavors, however, to fix such a sanctuary as a *separate locality* in heaven, which locality is the *real* archetype of the Mosaic tabernacle, fail, in the fact, that "the different attributes here assigned to Christ, taken literally, exclude one another," (Thol.), and that according to Exodus xxv., not only the tabernacle but also all its utensils were to be made after the heavenly model. We must thus regard this expression as a *sensible embodiment* of the idea of the reconciliation and restoration of our fellowship with God, wrought through Christ, introduced by the designation of Christ's mission as a Priestly one, for which reason also Luther, with most of the ancients, understood by the sanctuary simply the spiritual *blessings* belonging to the kingdom of God.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The *patterns* after which we are to regulate our life and our condition, have been *shown to us by God*, and *described* in the *Holy Scriptures*.—It is only by His *royal* throne in heaven that the *High-Priestly* dignity, power and work of Jesus, are rendered to us truly intelligible, challenge our admiration, and reach the depth of our spiritual needs.—Whether we let the High-Priest whom we *have*, also influence us for our salvation?—As the people of the New Testament we belong to the *heavenly sanctuary*, and thereby have great *prerogatives:* how do we stand with reference to the corresponding duties?

STARKE:—Thanks be to God that we have a High-Priest who sits at the right hand of the Majesty on high, and whose sacrifice and intercession have, therefore, unlimited power.—Christ is the fosterer of His Church. He Himself communicates the holy and heavenly gift. Would that we with perfect faith might hasten to this faithful High-Priest, and from the fulness of His grace, bring forth a real treasure and amplitude of heavenly blessings.—Precisely for the reason that Christ, after His one completed sacrifice, sits at the right hand of God, He fills all in all.—Whoever offers to God only the outward and corporeal, offers a Jewish, and not a Christian sacrifice.

RIEGER:—We have a Priest, such as we need. The Father has prepared Him; love and obedi-

ence have drawn Him into His office; He is perfected according to all that which was written aforetime with regard to Him; He is set before us in the Gospel, and faith lays hold upon Him.—As God has prepared to Himself a seat of Majesty, a central point of His Government, and of the bestowment of His life and His glory; He has also reared a dwelling, or holy tabernacle, in which is the seat of Majesty, and in which He receives the priestly service and worship of those who draw near to Him.—The Saviour has made use of the *temple*, as His Father's house, for *instruction*, and cleansed this house of prayer for all nations, from abuses; but on Golgotha, not at the foot of the altar, flowed His blood, shed upon the wood of His cross.

HAHN:—We must follow with our gaze the dear Saviour on His course of suffering clear up into heaven.

HEUBNER:—Were not Christ in this inconceivably close connection with God in heaven, He could not, in proper and complete authority, impart the forgiveness of sins, truly annihilate sin, and arrest its consequences.—Our service of God and priesthood should be an imitation and copy of the service of God in heaven.

II.

Christ's priestly service is by so much the more excellent, as the covenant of which He is Mediator, rests upon better promises than the old covenant, which, according to its own testimony, is destined to destruction.

CHAPTER VIII. 6–13.

6 But now [as it is] hath he obtained[1] a more excellent ministry, by how much also he
is the mediator of a better covenant, which was [hath been] established upon better
7 promises. For if that first *covenant* had been faultless, then should [would] no place
8 have been [be] sought for the second. For [while] finding fault with them he saith, Be-
hold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house
9 of Israel and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made
with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the
land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not
10 [disregarded them], saith the Lord. For [Because] this *is* the[2] covenant that I will
make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord: I will put my laws
into their mind, and will write [inscribe] them in [on] their hearts: and I will be to
11 them a God, and they shall be to me a people: And they shall not teach every man his
neighbor, [fellow-citizen, *πολίτην*],[3] and every man his brother, saying, Know ye the
12 Lord: for all shall [will] know me, from the least[4] unto the greatest. For I will be
merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities[5] will I remember
13 no more. In that he saith, A new *covenant*, he hath made the first old. Now [But]
that which decayeth and waxeth old *is* ready to vanish away.

[1] Ver. 6.—The Attic form *τετύχηκε* instead of the Rec. *τέτευχε* is found in the Minusc. 47, 72, 73, 74. The form *τέτυχεν* however, is best supported on the authority of A. D*. K. L., 80, 116, 117. The Sin. has *τέτυχε*, but a second hand has put *τέτευχε*.

[2] Ver. 10.—A. D. E. add *μου* which is also found in many Codd. of the LXX. But it is wanting in the cod. Alex. of the LXX. and the Sin.

[3] Ver. 11.—Instead of *τὸν πλησίον*, according to all authority, should be read *τὸν πολίτην*.

[4] Ver. 11.—*Αὐτῶν* after *ἀπὸ μικροῦ* is to be erased after Sin. A. B. D*. E*. K. 17, 31, 61, 73, 80.

[5] Ver. 12.—The retaining of the words *καὶ τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν* is sustained by A. D. E. K. L. The Sin., however, has them only from the later hand. In B. 17, 23, Vulg. and other versions they are wanting.

[Ver. 6.—*νυνὶ δέ*, *but now, as it is*, as *the case actually stands*, contrasted with the case supposed ver. 4,—*ἥτις*, *as one which*, characteristic, *νενομοθέτηται*, *has been enacted*, instituted as matter of legislation, the word suggested by the *legal* character of the old covenant.

Ver. 7.—*οὐκ ἂν ἐζητεῖτο*, *would not be sought.*

Ver. 8.—*μεμφόμενος*, *blaming*, *finding fault*, either with it or them, or both; here, I think, mainly the former.

Ver. 9.—*ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου*, *in the day of my taking hold of them* for succor, see ch. ii. 16—*αὐτοί* and *κἀγώ* placed in contrast. God divides, in His tenderness, the blame between the people and himself.

Ver. 10.—*διδούς* *giving* either with *διαθήσομαι* understood from the preceding verse, or irregularly connected by *καί* with the following finite verb.—*ἐπιγράψω*, *I will write upon*, *inscribe*.

Ver. 11.—*οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν*, a familiar emphatic construction: There is no fear lest they may teach=*they shall by no means teach*,—*τὸν πολίτην*=*συμπολίτην*, *fellow-citizen*.—*εἰδήσω*, old Ionic Fut. for *εἴσομαι*, which thence past over to the later Attic.—*ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου*, *from small unto great of them.*

Ver. 12.—*ἵλεως*, *propitious*, *gracious*.—*οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ ἔτι*. *I will no longer make mention.*

Ver. 13.—*ἐν τῷ λέγειν καινήν*, *in saying "new."*—*πεπαλαίωκε*, *he hath rendered antiquated.*—*παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον*, *becoming antiquated and growing old.*—K].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 7. **But now**, *etc.*—In contrast with the supposition made in ver. 4, ver. 7 exhibits the actual state of the case, and reminds us that the priestly service of Christ, although there is no place for it in the Mosaic sanctuary, has still not less value than the so highly revered Levitical worship; nay rather by so much surpasses it as the New Covenant of which Christ is Mediator surpasses the Old Covenant, which, though also founded on Divine promises, yet, even by these themselves is reminded of its yet imperfect nature and transitory significance. The νυνὶ δέ is thus to be taken not temporally but logically, not, however, *deducing*, but *contrasting*, [as is uniformly the case in its logical use].

Ver. 6. **Establish.**—The expression νενομοθέτηται shows that the author regards the New Covenant partly as a fact which has been historically accomplished, partly as an economy of salvation and of life established by God, and for this reason not merely of binding authority, but also working according to fixed laws, as does also Paul, Rom. iii. 27; viii. 2; ix. 31.

Ver. 7. **There would no place be sought.**—Bleek finds the idea expressed that God would have had no need to seek in the *hearts* of men for a better place for His covenant than was furnished by the tables of stone; but, although the statement that the first covenant was not faultless refers to the outward and ceremonial character of the Old Testament institutions, still the author, if Bleek's idea had been in his mind, could hardly have omitted the words ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις. Moreover the emphasis is certainly not upon τόπος but upon δευτέρας. The translation "*would* have been sought" (Erasm., Calv., Bez., *etc.*), is erroneous, as it would have demanded the pluperfect. The following passage of Scripture which contains the promise of a new covenant, would seem, according to Del., to show that God in His *counsel* already had a place for such a covenant, and hence sought, in the *history of the world*, the place for its actualization. Thol. takes the τόπον ζητεῖν here as=τόπον λαμβάνειν, Acts xxv. 16, *i. e.*, *to take occasion*. Ebr. and Lün. assume a blending of the two clauses οὐκ ἂν ἦν τόπος δευτέρας=*there would have been no place for a second*, and οὐκ ἂν ἐζητεῖτο δευτέρα=*no second would be sought.*

Ver. 8. **For finding fault he saith to them.**—Lachmann reads after A. D*. K., 17, 39, αὐτούς. This reference to the Israelites is, however, possible even with the better attested reading αὐτοῖς, since μέμφεσθαι, is constructed alike with the Acc. and the Dat. In this construction the Peshito is followed by the Vulg., Chrys., Luth., Calv., Bisp., Del., and the majority. It is a more elegant and delicate construction, however, to leave the *object* of the fault-finding undetermined (De W., Ebr.), and with Faber Stapul., Piscat., Schlicht., Grot., Bl., Lün., Reiche, *etc.*, to connect αὐτοῖς with λέγει. We must not, however, exactly supply αὐτήν, and regard μεμφ. as corresponding directly with the preceding ἄμεμπτος. This corresponds not with the citation from Jer. xxxi. 31–34, in which the positive censure falls upon the people, and strikes but indirectly the covenant which was unable to secure right conduct in the nation. The designation of it here is=*not blameless* (ἄμεμπτος): and it is certainly inadmissible to regard the negative expression as on a level with a positive one. On the other hand Del. goes too far in regarding the *suppression* of the object of the blame, as an *ambiguity*. The construction rather intimates the two-fold applicability of the censure, and this is entirely consonant with the facts of the case. In the citation itself which adduces the Scripture proof of the preceding statement, the author puts συντελέσω for διαθήσομαι and ἐποίησα for διεθέμην, with the evident design of indicating even in the very words of the New Testament as on the part of God accomplished.

Ver. 10. **I will give.**—Διδούς, *giving*, stands not instead of δώσω, *I will give* (Beng., *etc.*), nor is either this now to be supplied (Heinr., Steng., *etc.*), although the Cod. Vat. of the LXX. reads διδοὺς δώσω, or εἰμί or ἔσομαι. If we supply any thing, it could be only διαθήσομαι (Del.), with which preceding word we can also with Lün. construct the Part. (*I will make a covenant, viz., in giving*), unless we prefer with Winer the not unfamiliar construction which makes a transition from the Part. to the finite verb. It is grammatically possible also (with Böhme and Paulus) to connect διδούς with the following ἐπιγράψω, in which case καί=also.

Ver. 13. **In that he saith a new covenant**, *etc.*—From the above cited passage our author, by emphasizing the καινή, *new*, draws the conclusion that the Mosaic economy is even in its very origin declared as the *old* covenant which appears as languishing and waxing old without hope of rejuvenation. Παλαιοῦν means originally not to *render antiquated*=to *do away as old and useless, to abrogate*, (Bez., Erasm., *etc.*) but, *to render ancient, or old*, to deliver over to the past, and to place in contrast with the *new*, with that which is hitherto non-existent. This transitive signification it has also, Job ix. 5; xxxii. 15; Lament. iii. 5; which, at Dan. vii. 25, passes over into the sense of *set aside as antiquated*. For what is consigned to the *past*, naturally *grows old* (*vetus*), and this in the case of the living is called *senescere*. The intransitive signification, *grow old* is found only at Is. lxv. 22. The word belongs to later Greek, and in extra biblical literature is in use only in the Mid. or Pass. The *Perf.* in our passage points to the completed act.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. From the *elevation of the Priest*, the author at ch. vii. 22, reasons to the elevation of the *covenant guaranteed* by Him in His everlasting existence; since those mortal priests who are appointed by command of the Law can sustain no comparison with the Royal Priest promised by the oath of God, potent in virtue of His indestructible life, the eternally perfected Son. There arises thus not a mere *inversion* of the relation, much less an argument *in a circle*, if here the author reasons from the superiority of the *covenant founded on better promises*, to the superiority of His priestly functions, who is not merely

the surety, but also the Mediator, *i. e.*, the founder, supporter, quickener of this covenant.

2. The New Covenant also has its institutions and arrangements, established by the *revelation of the Divine will*, whose foundations are laid in the *Messianic prophecies* of the Old Testament. Among them particularly stands forth in the relation here adverted to the prophecy, Jer. xxxi. 31–34 (whose parallel we find in Ezek. xxxvi. 25–27) which, *within the limits of the O. Test. itself*, expresses most clearly the contrast so strongly emphasized by Paul (2 Cor. iii. 6–9) between the economies of *law and gospel*, and the purely *disciplinary and educational*, and hence transitory nature of the Mosaic institutions.

3. In this prophecy there is promised a *new* Covenant, which Jehovah will make with Israel and with Judah, *i. e.*, with *the collective people*, whose restoration and reunion on the soil of the Promised Land is also promised by the prophet, a Covenant which shall have a different fate from that which was formed after the nation's deliverance from Egypt. The all holy God, in His righteousness, does away with the *old* relation to the *covenant-breaking* people; but in His grace will institute a system of salvation by a new Covenant, for which He already lays *the foundation* by *better* promises.

4. The superiority of these promises consists in the fact that the *Divine will* is no longer as a bare command to come into mere outward contact with the people, but is to *live and work in its heart;* that in consequence of this a *living knowledge of God* is to be the common blessing of *all* the members of the Covenant, and the distinction between prophets and non-prophets, priests and non-priests, to fall away; and that finally the ground of this will be the *forgiveness of sins* wrought without any human merits by *the grace of God.* Precisely for this reason could Jer. iii. 16, 17 even predict that the entire legal economy, nay, the very ark of the Covenant itself, would no more be an object of longing to the people. Intimations of this state of things are found, Joel iii. 1 ff.; Is. xi. 9; liv. 13; Ez. xi. 19.

5. From the disparagement of sacrificial worship which comes out frequently and strongly within the limits of the O. Test. itself (1 Sam. xv. 22 ff.; Ps. xl. 7 ff.; l.; li. 18 ff.; Hos. vi. 6; Jer. vii. 21–23; Prov. xxi. 3), we may not, however, conclude that the idea of *the death of Jesus Christ as an expiatory offering* is a relapse into Judaism—a sentiment in accordance with which HOLDHEIM (*on the Ceremonial Law in the Kingdom of the Messiah*, 1845) says: "The Rabbinical doctrine stands in this near relation to Christianity that they both rest on the common conviction that the principle of expiation contained in the Mosaic law is to be maintained as of perpetual truth and validity. Christianity bases on this the fact that by a single great sacrifice the work of expiation has been once for all accomplished for all who believe in it, while Rabbinical Judaism, holding the same fundamental idea, regards the sacrificial ritual as only temporarily done away, and looks forward to its restoration." This modern Judaism is as far removed from faith in the Old Testament as from faith in the gospel, and hence is equally incapable of comprehending both the one and the other. An arbitrary, self-willed and self-seeking separation from the legal worship is sharply rebuked by those same prophets who, turning away from the *external* character of the legal ceremonial and its meritorious works, *demand and predict* the *fulfilment* of that Divine *will* which is revealed in the law. But God, in the law, gave, on the one hand, not merely *moral* precepts, but also such as were intended to regulate the *collective social relations* of His people, and on the other, ordained, in a way which was unconditionally binding on the Israelites, the *means* for the fulfilment of these precepts, and for expiating their transgressions of His law. To these means belonged preëminently the *system of worship* whose central point is the *sacrificial service.* But in the position which God gave to the O. Test. in the economy of salvation, all its arrangements have a partly educational or disciplinary, partly a *typical* and *symbolical* character. It is hence equally erroneous to deny, on the one hand, *the reality of the idea* which at this stage could be expressed only in type and figure, and in the period of fulfilment, to turn back, on the other, to the types and symbols of *that earlier period*, whether this be done by *Rabbins*, who look forward to a simple restitution of the Mosaic ritual, or by *Mormons*, who have recently proposed the introduction of animal sacrifices into the Christian worship. Until the arrival of the period of *perfection*, it is true that even Christianity itself cannot dispense with symbols, and still bears a character which represents in the temporal and earthly the eternal and the heavenly. But its symbols have no longer *the appearance of any independent value*, and its type is the type of *the completion of revelation.*

6. The circumstance is of special importance that *not without*, but *within* the Old Covenant itself, and indeed only by *undoubted words of God*, was declared that capital defect of the Covenant mediated by Moses, which consisted in its want of provisions for effecting *a real forgiveness of sin, and genuine communion with God*, and that by the promise of a *new* Covenant the existing Covenant was already in the time of Jeremiah stamped as an institution no longer satisfactory, and destined to pass away. To Christians, then, the mere continued outward existence of Judaism can have no such import as to engender doubts of that *abrogation of the Old Covenant which has historically taken place.* Decay and superannuation clear to utter extinction are the inevitable destiny of that Covenant, allotted to it by the decision of God on the ground of its intrinsic nature.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The Old Covenant was not broken up from without, but was dissolved internally, and by God Himself given over to extinction.—The infidelity of the covenant-people might induce the judgments of God, and occasion the abrogation of the former covenant; but could not bring to naught God's purpose of salvation.—To the New Covenant belongs a new heart and a new spirit. —Forgiveness of sin is the foundation of all renewal; and this comes from grace by means of the New Covenant.—How the promises of the

Old Covenant are fulfilled by the Mediator of the New.

Starke:—How blessed are we in the New Covenant! We have so great a Mediator, such glorious promises, such glorious possessions! Is it not our shame that we still remain under the dominion of sin?—The Levitical law is to be sure in itself full of Divine goodness and wisdom, yet not adequate to our happiness; but only a shadow in comparison with the substance of the Messianic priesthood and kingdom.—God adheres faithfully to His covenant and promise: men are covenant-breakers. Woe unto them!—So tender is still God's love toward His people, that He brings them into danger and need as a father his child, then takes them by the hand and brings them into security.—On contempt of the Divine words follows the Divine punishment.—Put to thyself the question: Perceivest thou that the law of God has been traced by the pen of the Holy Spirit upon thy mind and heart? Recognizest thou also the Lord thy Saviour in living faith and obedience?—Believers, as God's covenant-people, are a blessed people.—The forgiveness of sins is the greatest treasure; without it the rich man has nothing, and with it the poorest man has all things.—Man, take God at these His words and sigh: Lord be gracious to my transgressions!—Thou seeker after vengeance, art thou not ashamed to say, "I will remember it of him!" when God says, "I will not remember it?"—Ceremonies which are not superstitious and sinful, can perhaps be endured for a season, although they have no special utility.

Rieger:—The function of a high-priest in heaven is for himself more dignified and noble, and better and more blessed for those in whom he is to execute the promises.—Those who were under the Old Testament said: We will! and did not know that they *could* not. Now that the grace of the New Testament has made it possible, many shield themselves under the pretext of a *cannot*, while yet there is a real *will not*.

Heubner:—God most honors and distinguishes Himself when He associates and deals with us not as a constraining Lord and Ruler, but as a Father with children. How are we put to shame by that announcement and awaiting of the New Covenant, which we linger so far behind!—The Old Covenant is past. Would to God that the old spirit of slavish service were gone with it, and the new spirit of *willingness* and *love* reigned in all!

PART THIRD.

Superiority of the New Covenant mediated by Jesus Christ.

FIRST SECTION.

THE NEW COVENANT PRODUCES FELLOWSHIP WITH GOD, WHICH THE OLD ONLY FIGURATIVELY REPRESENTS AND PROMISES.

I.

The typical and symbolical character of the Mosaic sanctuary points in itself to but an imperfect communion with God.

Chapter IX. 1–10.

Then verily [There belonged indeed now even to εἶχε μὲν οὖν καὶ] the first[1] *covenant* had
also [*om.* had also] ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary [its sanctuary as
2 one belonging to this world]. For there was a tabernacle made [κατεσκευάσθη, *constructed
and fitted out*, ch. iii. 4]; the first [foremost], wherein *was* the candlestick, and the table,
3 and the shewbread; which is called the [*om.* the] sanctuary. And after [μετά, *after*

4 =behind] the second vail, the tabernacle which is called the holiest of all; Which
had the golden censer [a golden altar of incense, *θυμιατήριον*], and the ark of the
covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein *was* the golden pot that had
5 manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant; And over
it the cherubim of glory shadowing the mercy seat; of which [things] we cannot now
6 speak particularly. Now when these things were thus ordained [And these things
having been thus arranged], the priests went [enter indeed] always into the first
7 tabernacle, accomplishing the service *of God* [their ministrations, *λατρείας*]; But
into the second *went* [enters] the high priest alone once every year [in the year], not
without blood, which he offered [offers] for himself, and *for* the errors of the people:
8 The Holy Ghost this signifying [signifying this], that the way into the holiest of all
[the sanctuary, *τῶν ἁγίων*] was not [has not been] yet made manifest, while as [*om.*
9 as] the first [foremost] tabernacle was [is] yet standing: Which *was* [is] a figure for
the time then [*om.* then] present, in which [according to which, *viz.*, figure][2] were
[are] offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not [cannot] make him that did the
service [him that renders the service, *τὸν λατρεύοντα*] perfect, as pertaining to the
10 conscience; *Which stood* only in [standing merely in connection with] meats and
drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances,[3] imposed *on them* until the time
of reformation.

[1] Ver. 1.—The word *σκηνή* of the *lect. rec.* is, according to all authorities, to be stricken out, and is not, with Peirce, Wetst., Seml., to be *understood*. The capital thought is *διαθήκη*, *covenant* [and this as, in Eng. ver., is clearly to be supplied in thought with *ἡ πρώτη*].

[2] Ver. 9.—For the Rec. *καθ᾽ ὅν*, we are, with Sin. A. B. D*., 17, 23*, 27, to read *καθ᾽ ἥν* [referring to *παραβολή*].

[3] Ver. 10.—For the Rec. *καὶ δικαιώμασι σαρκός*, the reading *δικαιώματα σαρκός* was approved by Grot., Mill and Beng., recommended by Griesb., and by all recent editors is received into the text. The *καί* is wanting in Sin. A. D*., 6, 17, 27, 31, and *δικαιώματα*, is found in Sin. A. B. and ten minusc., the sing. *δικαίωμα* in D*.

[*Εἶχε μὲν οὖν*, *had indeed, to be sure, now.* *Οὖν*, as usual, links the coming discussion with what precedes; the concessive *μέν* intimates that the prerogatives here *conceded* to the Old Covenant, are to find by and by their *limitations*, as at ver. 6, or at ver. 11. The "then verily" of the Eng. ver. has no warrant either in the original or in the context. Alford's rendering "now accordingly," is very little better.—*τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν* not, *and a worldly sanctuary*, but *and its sanctuary*, as one *belonging to the world*. It is difficult to take the words as=*τὸ ἅγ τὸ κοσ.*, *the*, or *its*, *worldly sanctuary*. It is also hard *here* to take *κοσμικόν* as purely predicative, viz., *its sanctuary a worldly one*=*the sanctuary which it had belonged to the world*. Better, perhaps, to regard it as *quasi* predicative, as a sort of *after thought*=and *its sanctuary, to wit, one belonging to the world*.

Ver. 2.—*Κατεσκευάσθη*, *was constructed*, *reared*, *established*, not exactly, *made*—*ἅγια*, *holy place*, *sanctuary*, not, *the sanctuary*.

Ver. 3.—*θυμιατήριον*, probably not *censer*, but *altar of incense*. (See below).

Ver. 6.—*τούτων δε οὕτως κατεσ.*, *and these things having been thus arranged*,—*the priests enter*, *etc.* This construction is scarcely a solecism, as Alford calls it, but is, I think, perfectly good English, although "being thus arranged," would here express nearly the same idea, and would give the sense with sufficient exactness.—*εἰσίασιν*, not *went*, but *enter*, as ver. 7.—*προσφέρει*, not *offered*, but *offers*, and so of other verbs in this passage. And the explanation is not that the author "conceives of the whole system and arrangement as still subsisting," but simply employs the *historical present*, transporting himself back into the past, and indicating that the priestly and high-priestly entrances which he describes, followed upon the previously described arrangements. It seems extraordinary that this simple and obvious, and only natural explanation of the passage, should have been so generally lost sight of, and the author charged with ignorance and mistakes which in such a writer, to say nothing of his inspiration, are utterly inconceivable, and which are in fact purely factitious, being chargeable only on the failure of his critics to recognize a natural and elegant rhetorical usage. The idea that the author fancied that the sacred articles above described were found either in the then existing temple, or even in the temple of Solomon, is countenanced by nothing in the text. There is no good reason for supposing that his mind past beyond the Mosaic tabernacle, the original and proper symbol of the Old Covenant, whose grand leading features indeed were reproduced in the temple, of which, however, the author makes no mention.

Ver. 7.—*ὃ προσφέρει*, *which he offers*—*ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ*, *on behalf of himself*.

Ver. 8.—*πεφανερῶσθαι*, has been (not "*was*") *made manifest*, the Perf. in keeping with the Pres. *εἰσίασι*, and *προσφέρει*, and *προσφέρονται* (ver. 9).—*τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς*, *the foremost tabernacle*.—*ἐχούσης στάσιν*, *holding or retaining its standing, place, position*.

Ver. 9.—*ἥτις*, as usual characteristic; *as one which*=*quippe quæ*.—*παραβολή* (*ἐστιν*, understood), *is a likeness*, *similitude*, *figure:* supply *is*, not *was* (*ἦν*), because the whole construction is in the historical present.—*εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα*, *for the present*, or *existing season*, *viz.*, not that of the time of the writer (as supposed by some), but that of the Old Economy of which and for which the outer tabernacle was a *παραβολή*; and the Part. *ἐνεστηκότα* keeps up the figure of the present time, as in the verb *εἰσίασιν*, *etc.* To make this *ἐνεστ. καιρόν* refer to the Messianic period, even with Alford's explanation, that it is not a figure *of*, but *for* the present time, is still to deprive it of nearly all its significance, and, when taken in connection with the following *καθ᾽ ἣν δῶρα προσφέρονται*, is inextricably to confuse the whole passage.—*καθ᾽ ἥν*, *according to which*, scil. *παραβολήν*, *figure*, or *emblem*.—*προσφέρονται*, *are being offered* in this present ante-Christian time into which the author has thrown himself back.

Ver. 10.—*μόνον ἐπί*, *only conditioned upon*, or, as Moll, *standing in connection with;* hardly, with Alf. and Eng. ver., *consisting in*, or *standing in*, which could scarcely be affirmed of the gifts and sacrifices. They stood connected with them, or as it were conditioned upon them.—*μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως*, *until the season of rectification*.—*ἐπικείμενα*, *lying upon*, as burdens.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 1. **There belonged, indeed, now also to the first**, *etc.*—The *καί*, *also* or *even*, points to a *parallel* instituted between the Old and the New Covenant. *Μὲν οὖν* intimates that, in accordance with the preceding representation, this actual result is to be recognized, that the *concession* here made of the excellencies of the Old Covenant [*εἶχε μέν*, *had to be sure, had, I grant*] is to be followed by its *limitations*, which reduce these arrangements of the Old Covenant to their true value, and at ver. 6 ff. bring out the *contrasted* features of the New Covenant. The preterites *εἶχε* and *κατεσκευάσθη* prove not that the destruction of the temple has as yet actually taken place, but refer, the former to the

covenant which God Himself has made antiquated (πεπαλαίωκεν, ch. viii. 13), the other to that Mosaic sanctuary which stood connected with it, and was copied after the heavenly pattern. As the language has to do with arrangements for *worship*, the word δικαιώματα, *ordinances*, needs a more precise limitation. Hence we are not, with Luth., Grot., *etc.*, to take λατρείας as Acc. plur., but as Gen. sing. The δικ. are thus characterized as ordinances of *divine worship*, and are, by the particle τε, closely attached to ἅγιον. This word should not, therefore, with Luth., Carpz., and others, be taken in an *ethical* sense; but designates the *sanctuary* whose constituent parts are immediately recounted. Previously, however, it is more exactly characterized by the adj. κοσμικόν, which either, according to later usage, is connected with the noun *without* the article (Bernhardy *Synt.*, p. 323), or, since it is common to connect ἔχειν with a definite object, and a *predicative* adj. without the article (*Madvig* § 12), and since this construction is also familiar to our author (ch. v. 14; vii. 28), gives predicatively the characteristic quality of the sanctuary in question. A comparison with vv. 11 and 24, shows that it stands in contrast with ἐπουράνιον, and hence can mean only *sæculare* (Vulg.), *belonging to this world;* not, "accessible to the whole world, and thus even to the heathen" (Chrys., Erasm., and others)—which, in fact, was true of only *a part* of the sanctuary, the court of the Gentiles—nor "celebrated throughout the whole world" (Kypke); nor "adorned, decorated, well-furnished and arranged" (Homberg); nor "symbolizing the universe" (as Theodor. Mops., Theodoret, Grot., and others).

Ver. 2. **For a tabernacle**, *etc.*—The author designates the two parts of the tabernacle, separated by a veil, the holy place, and the Holy of holies, as two tabernacles (vv. 2, 3); hence ἡ πρώτη, added to define the preceding general word σκηνή, is here not *temporal*, but *local*, and the neut. plur. ἅγια stands contrasted with the ἅγια ἁγίων. It is erroneously taken by Erasm., Luth., and others, as fem. sing. ἁγία. In the temple of Solomon there were ten candlesticks, 1 Kings vii. 49; 2 Chron. iv. 7; in that of Herod, on the contrary (after Ex. xxv. 31 ff.; xxxvii. 17 ff.), only one (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.*, V. 5, 5; VII. 5, 5) of fine gold with seven branches, standing on the south side. On the north side stood the table of cedar-wood, overlaid with gold plates, two cubits long, one broad, one cubit and a-half high, with golden rings at its feet for two poles by which it was carried. On this table were the censers and the "loaves of the presence" (shew bread), *i. e.*, twelve cakes of finest meal, each six palms long, five broad, and a finger in thickness, which lay supported on golden forks and cross-pieces, and were each week eaten by the priests. Our author appears to name, not the things themselves, but their sacred use, *viz.*, πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων, *the setting forth of the loaves.* Since the LXX., however, use this expression, 2 Chron. xiii. 11, for the translation of מַעֲרֶכֶת הַלֶּחֶם, *the keeping up of the bread*, we need not, with Bl., De W., and Lün., maintain against Thol., that the *passive* meaning is, perhaps, possible in Heb. and Lat. (*strues*), but not in Greek. Nor may we, with Grot., Beng., and others, assume a *hypallage*, nor a *hendyadis* with Valckenaer.

Ver. 3. **And behind the second veil.**—In this verse the author appears to commit an archæological error in transferring to the inner sanctuary the altar of incense. For Joseph. (*Bell. Jud.*, V. 5, 5) and Philo (*Ed. Mang.*, I. 504) place the altar of incense (two cubits high, a cubit in length, and a cubit in breadth, and overlaid with gold), consisting of acacia wood (in the temple of Solomon of cedar wood, 1 Kings vi. 20), in the holy place between the candlestick and the table. The great importance of this springs from the fact that Ex. xxx. 10, *this*, as well as at xl. 10, *the altar of burnt offering*, is designated by the name ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων, and that, on the annual great day of atonement, this was purified by the high-priest with the same blood which he bore into the Holiest of all, Lev. xvi. 18. Also it is called, Ex. xl. 5, 24; Num. iv. 11, τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσοῦν. It is hence inadmissible to suppose that our author has entirely omitted to mention this altar, and that θυμιατήριον may denote the *censer* (Pesh., Vulg., Theoph., Luth., Grot., Wets., Beng., Stier, Bisp., *etc.*). These expositors (including some profoundly versed in Heb. antiquities, as Reland, De Dieu, Braun, Deyling, J. D. Michael.) appeal, indeed, to the fact that the altar of incense is commonly called τὸ θυσιαστήριον θυμιάματος, while the censer on the other hand is called (Ezek. viii. 11; 2 Chron. xxvi. 19; Joseph. *Antt.* IV. 2, 4) θυμιατήριον. From this, however, we can draw no certain inference, as we can point out no constant and uniform mode of designating these utensils. The word θυμιατήριον appears in Joseph., Philo, Clem. Alex., Orig., as the common term for the altar of incense, and is even found several times as a various reading in the Sept. Besides, the golden censer is only mentioned in the ritual of the second temple, under the name of כַּף, but not in the *Law*, to which alone our author refers. There is only a *shovel-formed* basin mentioned Lev. xvi. 12, with which the high-priest brought the coals from the altar of burnt offering, and this is called מַחְתָּה, πυρεῖον, and is not spoken of as gold. Nor need we attach any weight to the fact that Joseph. (*Bell. Jud.* I. 7, 6; *Antt.* XIV. 4, 4), in enumerating the objects which Pompey saw in the sanctuary, mentions only the golden table and candlestick, the abundance of incense and the sacred presents, but not the *altar;* and (*Bell. Jud.*, VI. 5, 5) speaks only of the carrying away of the candlestick and table. For, however surprising it may be, that even on the triumphal arch of Titus are sculptured only the golden table, the candlesticks, and the vessels of incense, still all this proves nothing for our passage, in which the author is speaking of the divinely instituted arrangements of the tabernacle, not describing the later temple; for in this temple were found no longer, even in the time of Solomon (1 Kings viii. 6), the here mentioned pot of manna, the budding rod of Aaron, and, after the loss of the ark of the Covenant, its place was indicated in the temple of Herod only by a stone. Bleek,

Lün., and others, therefore, assume, in explanation of the error which they charge upon our author regarding the position of the altar of incense, that, a stranger to Jerusalem, he has drawn his knowledge of the sanctuary of Israel only from the writings of the Old Testament, and has been led astray, 1, by Ex. xxvi. 35, where only table and candlestick are mentioned as furniture of the sanctuary; 2, by the indefinite and easily misunderstood statement regarding the position of the altar, Ex. xxx. 6; xl. 5, 26; Lev. iv. 7; xvi. 12, 18; and 3, by the special distinguishing of the altar of incense at the great day of atonement. But it is scarcely conceivable, that in matters so generally known, and in a communication to the Hebrews so carefully elaborated, and so intrinsically important, the author should have allowed himself in so gross an error as that of placing the altar of incense behind the second veil (which was called καταπέτασμα in distinction from the first, the κατάλυμμα). Add to this that the author would then have involved himself in contradiction with another well-known fact, and even with himself. For at ver. 7 he notices the fact that the high-priest went but once a year into the holiest of all. Must he, then, not have known that on the altar of incense the incense offering was daily made as symbol of prayer (Rev. viii. 3), not merely by the priests on whom the lot fell (Luke i. 9), but frequently by the high-priest himself? Most unquestionably, since ver. 6 he himself refers to this service of the priests. We are, therefore, justified in assuming that the author does not refer here to *local position* (for which he uses ἐν) but that the part. ἔχουσα, *having*, may probably denote the idea of *belonging to*, which in Heb. is denoted by לְ. This explanation is, in fact, adopted by many of those interpreters, who, referring it, indeed, to the *censer*, yet suppose that this latter had its permanent place not in the Most Holy place, but in the utensil chamber (Theophyl., Grot., Beng., Menken, Stier, *etc.*), since, according to Lev. xvi. 13, the precise purpose of the incense was to prevent the high-priest from beholding the Capporeth, and it seemed unnatural to suppose that the high-priest had let the incense-vessel remain over the whole year in the inner sanctuary, and then on the day of atonement should have exchanged it with the one recently brought from the utensil chamber of the temple; or that the high-priest should have brought in incense and coals in a golden vessel, and shaken these upon a special incense-vessel, which had its fixed place in the inner sanctuary (Peirce). Surrendering the *local* sense of ἔχειν (as we certainly must, ver. 1), it is assuredly more natural to refer the term to the far more important *altar of incense;* and we may point in confirmation to the fact, that not only Is. vi. 6 introduces an altar belonging to the heavenly sanctuary, but that at 1 Kings vi. 22, the connection between the altar of incense and the holy of holies is expressed by the form הַמִּזְבֵּחַ אֲשֶׁר לַדְּבִיר = *the altar belonging to the inner shrine*, the adytum (Keil against Thenius: so also Ebr., Del., Riehm); so also according to Ex. xxx. 6; Deut. xl. 5, it would seem to have been placed over against the ark of the Covenant, and on the day of atonement to have been, like the *Capporeth*, sprinkled with the blood of the sacrifice (Lev. xvi. 18). The only ground of doubt would lie in the circumstance that the mention of the ark of the Covenant immediately follows (connected by καί), and that this most unquestionably had its place (Ex. xxvi. 34) in the holiest of all. But we must not forget that though the ark of the Covenant was, indeed, brought (1 Kings viii.) into the temple of Solomon, yet it perished in the destruction of that temple by the Chaldeans, so that the second temple had, in its most holy place, absolutely none of these articles, as JOSEPH. (*Bell. Jud.* V. 5, 5) expressly testifies (ἔκειτο δὲ οὐδὲν ὅλως ἐν αὐτῷ). This also confirms our belief that the purpose of the author is not to describe the holy localities and furniture of the second temple, but that these things are mentioned only in order to exhibit that which mirrored forth the peculiar nature and dignity, and especially the symbolical and typical character, of the Mosaic sanctuary. The assumption of Wieseler, that the temple at Leontopolis had precisely the arrangement here mentioned, and possessed sacred objects and utensils, modelled after the pattern of those here enumerated, is a hypothesis quite destitute of any historical proof.

In which was a golden pot, *etc.*—Ἐν ᾗ refers not to σκηνή (Justiniani, Pyle, Peirce), but to κιβωτός, and stands in contrast with ὑπεράνω. The same idea that the pot of manna and the rod of Aaron were kept in the ark of the Covenant itself, is found with later writers, who appeal to the authority of tradition (see Wetst.); and the expressions of Scripture make rather for than against it. The locality is indeed, Ex. xvi. 33, left undetermined by the mere regulation that the pot shall be kept for a memorial "*before Jehovah.*" But it is said of it, ver. 34, and, Numb. xvii. 25, of the rod of Aaron, that they were placed לִפְנֵי הָעֵדוּת *before the testimony.* This term, however, never denotes the ark, but often designates the law. Besides the tables of the law, such objects might perhaps well have their most fitting place in the sacred ark, as being essentially memorials and symbols of the miraculous interpositions of Divine grace (Ebr.), and not *mere* contrasts to those fruits and products of the earth which were daily or weekly presented in the sanctuary. In the sojourn of the ark among the Philistines, these objects, fraught indeed with religious significance, yet not belonging to the rites of worship, might have disappeared, since we are told, 1 Kings viii. 9, that on the removal of the ark into the temple of Solomon, it contained *nothing but* the two tables of the law.

VER. 5. **The cherubim of glory.**—The article before δόξης, in Griesb. and Schultz, is, according to all the uncial MSS., to be expunged. The Gen., however, serves here not to designate the glorious or splendid quality of the two symbolical figures, wrought massively out of fine gold, which occupied the two extremities of the cover of the ark of the Covenant, upon which, with faces turned toward each other, they looked

down, and which they covered with their outspread wings. We must rather refer it to the δόξα θεοῦ, which also stands at 1 Sam. iv. 22; Sir. xlix. 8, without an article, because regarded as a *proper name*, and which was throned above the cherubim, 1 Sam. iv. 4; 2 Sam. vi. 2; 2 Kings xix. 15; Is. xxxvii. 16. But the throne of God is called, Ez. ix. 3; x. 4, 18, 19, a throne of glory, כִּסֵּא הַכָּבוֹד. But from this throne of the sacred service God was pleased also to speak to Moses, Ex. xxv. 22; Numb. vii. 89. For the massive golden cover of the ark of the Covenant (which ark itself was overlaid within and without with plates of gold) had essentially the significance of a mediation between the ark of the Covenant and the God who was enthroned above it, 1 Chron. xxviii. 2; Ps. xcix. 5; cxxxii. 7; Is. lxvi. 1; Lam. Jer. ii. 1. Primarily it was the footstool of the throne, whose bearers or symbols are the cherubim, and which rests upon the covenant of the law. For equity and righteousness, as revealed in the law of God, form the pillars of this throne, Ps. lxxxix. 15; xcvii. 2; whence also the sanctuary, and particularly the ark of the Covenant itself, is the throne of Jehovah, Ex. xv. 17; 1 Kings viii. 13. By the sprinkling of the blood of the sin-offering, however, the *Capporeth* becomes not so much the cover to that law which worketh the wrath of God (Hofm. after Hengst.), as a *ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα, propitiatory covering*, Ex. xxv. 16, and then a ἱλαστήριον in general, according to Lev. xvi. 15 ff. The idea of *covering* has transformed itself into that of *expiation, i. e., covering of sin*, whence also, 1 Chron. xxviii. 11, the most holy place is called בֵּית הַכַּפֹּרֶת. While Josephus writes *οἱ* and *αἱ* χερουβεῖς, and Philo always τὰ χερουβίμ, the LXX. fluctuate between the ordinary form of the neut. and the rarer one of the masc. The closing syllable also varies between βεὶμ, βεὶν, βὶμ, and βὶν. The neut. springs from the fact of their being regarded as ζῶα, Ezek. x. 15. The περὶ ὧν, *concerning which things*, refers not (as Ebr.) merely to the cherubim.

Ver. 6. **Once in the year**, *etc.*—Since the high-priest, on the tenth day of the seventh month, Tisri, the day of atonement (יוֹם הַכִּפֻּרִים), was obliged to go at least twice into the inner sanctuary, Lev. xvi. 12 ff.; according to the *Mishna tract.*, Joma v. 1; vii. 4, four times,—ἅπαξ, *once*, is best understood of what took place once in a year, although consisting of several separate acts,—a sense belonging to the words at 3 Macc. xi. 1; Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* V. 5, 7. To this view we are also led by the following verses. For with the blood of the heifer the high-priest made expiation for his own sin; with the blood of the goat expiation for the sins of the congregation; and this distinction is here made, and this rightly so, that the sins are called ἀγνοήματα; see at ch. v. 2. The accomplishment of this twofold expiation required, however, a twofold entrance into the inner sanctuary, both of which principal acts were preceded by an entrance with a dish of coals and a censer of incense, and followed by a fourth after the evening sacrifice for the bringing out of these utensils. In accordance with his hypothesis, Wieseler connects the words "not without blood," *etc.*, closely with the leading clause; which produces, however, an entirely false contrast with ver. 6. Nor are we necessarily to infer from the Perf. Part. κατεσκευασμένων—to be referred, at all events, to ver. 2—that the author regards the two grand divisions of the Mosaic sanctuary, together with their contents, as also still existing in the Jewish temple of his time (Lün.), nor do the present tenses, εἰσίασιν and προσφέρει, of themselves lead necessarily to the conclusion that the author wrote before the destruction of the temple. We need only suppose that this form of expression in its connection with the context implies that the legal worship was still in existence, and that on the basis of the old Mosaic arrangements, reaching down into the time of the author, while the preservation or loss of certain vessels or utensils of the service is a matter of as profound indifference as the replacing of the tabernacle by the temple of Solomon, and the differences in this before and after the exile.

Blood which he offers, *etc.*—The expression, προσφέρειν τὸ αἷμα, Lev. i. 5; vii. 33; Ez. xliv. 7, 15, points to the *sprinkling* (הַזָּאָה), which was made once upwards, and seven times downwards, towards the Capporeth. This was followed by the נְתִינָה, *besmearing* of the horns of the altar of incense with the mingled blood of the heifer and goat, with which the altar itself was seven times sprinkled; then the שְׁפִיכָה, *pouring out on the altar of burnt offering*. The slaughter (שְׁחִיטָה) connected with the laying on of the hand (סְמִיכָה) merely rendered possible the offering of the blood; but this, in that it was the means of expiation, rendered possible that presentation of the gift upon the altar, or offering (הַקְטָרָה), which was acceptable to God. On the strength of this blood-accomplished expiation, the priests could, throughout the year, present in the sanctuary the daily and weekly offerings. The absence of the article before ἑαυτοῦ proves that this word is not (with the Vulg., Luth., Calv., Grot., and others) to be made dependent on ἀγνοημάτων.

Ver. 8. **The Holy Spirit showing this**, *etc.*—The τοῦτο refers to the following Acc. with Inf., and δηλοῦν is used here of *prophecy by act or symbol*, while at ch. xii. 27; 1 Pet. i. 11, it is used of prophetic foreshowing by word (ver. 12). The τῶν ἁγίων, too, refers not to persons (Peshito, Schultz), but to the true sanctuary (ch. x. 19). The Gen. stands, as Jer. ii. 18, τῇ ὁδῷ Αἰγύπτου, and Matth. x. 5, ὁδὸς ἐθνῶν, of the *end* or *goal* of the way. Πρώτη designates here not the first Jewish sanctuary—first in time (as Grot., Carpz., Beng., Böhme, *etc.*), but the first or forward tabernacle, in contrast with that behind it (the second, ver. 7).

Ver. 9. **Which is an image for the time**, *etc.*—Erasm., Beng., *etc.*, refer ἥτις in the sense of ὅτι to the entire preceding clause, and explain the fem. by the attraction of παραβολή: the ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστηκώς thus becomes the time in which the author wrote; and the circumstance that the outer and the inner sanctuary stood separated

beside and distinct from each other, is regarded as an image of that time in which the yet undestroyed Theocracy of Israel forms, as it were, the outer space and locality for the Christianity which has sprung up within its bosom. The same view is shared by Boehme and Klee, yet with the difference that they connect ἥτις with παραβολή, and make it, as such, the subject of the clause=*which figure or symbol* applies to the present time. De W. adheres to the latter construction, but=with most intpp., explains the ὁ καιρ. ὁ ἐνεσ. of the antechristian period extending down into the present, thus=ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐνεστώς, Gal. i. 4. Granting the possibility of this meaning of the phrase (which Del. on insufficient grounds controverts), it is still more natural to refer ἥτις to σκηνή, not to στάσιν (Chr. F. Schmid), nor by any means to ὁδόν (Cramer). For if the author has previously designated the Holy of holies as παραβολή, *likeness*, *emblem* (Luth., erroneously, *type*), of the Christian economy, why should not he now designate the "holy place" as an emblem of the Jewish economy, especially as it is his precise purpose to state *in how far* Judaism, as a merely intermediate system, appeared precisely represented by the sanctuary? (Thol. against De Wette). In still closer correspondence with the mere words, indeed, we might (with Del. and Alf., after John Damasc. and Primas.) refer the καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστ. to the present time, as commencing with the inauguration of the New Covenant, and interpret it of the καιρὸς διορθώσεως, and either with Carpz., Hermann and others, translate "clear down to the present time" [or, with Alf., render *for*, in reference to, the present time].* But this is forbidden by the context (Riehm, Reiche, Lün.), inasmuch as the καιρὸς διορθώσεως, ver. 10, or the time of restoration and rectification appointed of God, is here evidently the *Christian* period of the world's history, and with it stands contrasted the ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστηκώς, whose emblem is the outer sanctuary, separated from the All-holy by a veil, and in accordance with which figure or παραβολή there exist, of course, only external and merely ceremonial institutions for securing perfection. Lünemann less fittingly refers the καθ' ἥν to πρώτη σκηνή. [There can be no doubt that in the first place, ἡ πρώτη σκηνή is here, as at ver. 2, the first *in place*, the foremost, tabernacle, as distinguished from the second one, the Holy of holies. In the second place, ἥτις, with the author, refers properly to σκηνή, and marks the σκηνή as a proper symbol and emblem of Judaism, which it precisely was. The foremost tabernacle or sanctuary was cut off from the second by a veil, which none could pass but the high-priest alone, and he only once a year, and for but the briefest stay within. The first tabernacle, therefore, stood there confronting, and indeed formed by, that awful veil, and the dread Holy Presence behind it, as a standing reminder to priests and people of their *separation from God;* that the way into the most holy place was not yet made manifest, and of course that the Jewish ritual, in connection with which they stood, was utterly unable to secure true forgiveness, and bring in the needed perfection. That foremost tabernacle, then, was the emblem and figure of Judaism. In the third place, the εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα refers decidedly (as against Del. and Alf.) not to the now present time of the writer, the time of fulfilment and completion, but to the antechristian period, the era of Judaism, *in reference to which and for which* this outer tabernacle stood as an emblem. Nor need we, with many, and apparently Moll, suppose this time to be represented as extending down to the present, and thus explain the ἐνεστηκώς. Like all the tenses of the passage in this connection, it stands of the past conceived as present, the author throwing himself back in the whole representation into the past, although I would not *deny* the justice of the view that perhaps the author the more readily adopted this figure because the Jewish sacrifices had even yet a lingering existence: though I see no necessity for this. Thus this outer tabernacle is a παραβολή, an emblem of the imperfect character of Judaism for the existing time, *etc.*—K.].

To render perfect as to the conscience, *etc.*—The idea of συνείδησις (E. V., *conscience*), is more comprehensive on the one hand than that of *conscience*, on the other than that of *internal consciousness*. The word designates the inmost conviction of our moral self-consciousness, so that ch. x. 2, we can have the words συνείδησις ἁμαρτιῶν, and 1 Pet. ii. 19, συνείδησις θεοῦ. The words thus refer not merely to the quieting of an accusing conscience (Theodoret, Calov, *etc.*), and not merely to the moral perfection of the consciousness (Schultz, Bl., De W.), but to the fact that the worshipper could not by the presentation of his offerings, attain his end in a way that met the demands of his moral and religious self-consciousness, could not, that is to say, attain to ἁγιότης.

VER. 10. **Purely in connection with meats,** *etc.*—'Επί designates not the objects for the sake of which the offerings are to be brought (Schlicht., Limb., *etc.*), or in respect of which a Levitical perfection actually takes place, as an outward and *provisional* means of justification. For μόνον ἐπί is to be connected neither with τελειῶσαι (Schlicht., Ebr.), nor with λατρεύοντα (Luth., Este, *etc.*), but with ἐπικείμενα, which stands parallel with δυνάμεναι, and as, along with this participle, it refers to δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι, might on account of the intervening clauses, be easily changed to the neuter. It is by no means to be referred, with the Vulg., to δικαιώμασιν, being thus taken=ἐπικειμένοις. Nor with the amended text is it either necessary or proper to take ἐπικείμενα as apposition to δικαιώματα, and refer μόνον to this latter word (Lün.). 'Επί can, to be sure, express the *adding* or *accession* of something to something else, or outward neighborhood or proximity. But "meats and drinks" are not—as neither are ordinances regarding food—equivalent to forbidden meats. Quite as little does the term refer to sacrificial feasts (Peirce, Storr, Heinr., *etc.*), or to the Paschal supper (Bl., De W.). For δικαιώματα are not *means of justification*, but *ordinances*, and precisely such, and referring to the *flesh*, are the δικαιώματα λατρείας of the Old Testament. 'Επί with the dat. signifies commonly the foundation on which, and

* [So I fill out the apparently imperfect sentence of the original.—K.].

at the same time, the circumstances connected with which, any thing is done. The Gen. σαρκός may also denote that the things bear in themselves the nature of the σάρξ. We should here refer the term to the historical superficiality and perishableness of these legal institutions (ch. vii. 16), but that the connection indicates the Gen. as referring here not to the *quality*, but to that which is the *object* of the ordinances, as 1 Sam. viii. 9, 11; x. 25. τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ βασιλέως denotes the Divine ordinance regarding the king.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. From the fact that God Himself has declared the Old Covenant incapable of attaining its purpose of salvation, and doomed it to abrogation, it still does not follow that its peculiar ordinances of Divine worship were therefore *valueless*. Nor, on the other hand, does the fact that they owe their origin to Divine revelation, and hence have an authority transcending that of any mere human arrangements, prove that they are *binding* upon the subjects of the *New* Covenant, or put them on *the same level* with its institutions of grace. They have rather, in accordance with the character of the Old Covenant, partly a typical and symbolical nature, partly a pedagogical and disciplinary significance, and as such possessed a high value.

2. With all the *glory* evinced in the furnishing of the Holy place and the Holy of holies, and with all the *sacredness* and *majesty* of the acts of religious service which transpired within them, still the entire arrangement of the vessels of the service, the separation of the outer from the inner sanctuary by the veil which concealed the latter, the distinction of people, priests and high-priests, the nature of the sacred acts which each separate class was characteristically to perform, their ritual and ceremonial character, incontrovertibly show that reconciliation with God and the dwelling of God with His people, here existed only in mere *representation, promise,* and *symbolical expression.*

3. This relation of the Old Testament sanctuary and worship as a type and emblem, to the actual communion of redeemed men with the holy God in the time of the real and actual reëstablishment of right relations, is no arbitrary one, but is *prophetically announced and made known by the Holy Spirit Himself.* In this lies the Scriptural ground and justification of a historical treatment which seeks the typical reference in the symbols of the Old Covenant itself. Still the principle must be judiciously and cautiously applied.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

We need no longer *seek* the way to the heavenly sanctuary as if it were *unknown*, and may not complain, as if it were *closed* to us; rather we can and should walk on *the way which has been opened to us.*—What the Holy Spirit has *instituted and produced, can only through the illumination* of the Holy Spirit, be rightly understood and treated.—No outward splendor of religious worship can make good the absence of *true communion with God.*—By its employment *in the service of God* even the earthly and the outward comes into relation to the eternal, and stands connected with the inner life of man.—Nature, value, and use of the means supplied by Divine worship for our spiritual well being.

STARKE:—No service of God can be without ceremonies; but that is the most excellent which has cast off external parade and has the most of the power of the Spirit.—If the Lord's house on earth has been glorious, much more is that above in heaven.—If every Christian is under obligation to serve God publicly in His temple, much more must preachers be always at hand when the public worship of God is celebrated.—Heaven stands open; but the place is holy; nothing common and impure will be admitted, Rev. xxi. 27.—Preachers bear their treasure in earthen vessels; they too are sinners, and must, like others, seek the cleansing away of their sins.—The outward worship of God is nothing without the inward; it then becomes only sin to him who renders the service, and ministers condemnation rather than salvation.—Under the New Covenant we may, without violating the conscience, eat and drink that which contributes to our enjoyment; only with moderation and thanksgiving, Col. ii. 16; 1 Tim. iv. 3.—Outward and bodily washing and cleansing stand in no proper relation to Divine worship. But as neatness and cleanliness are always becoming and attractive, it behooves us also to appear before and serve God in outward purity, 1 Tim. ii. 9.—The outward chastening of the body is but a miserable service of God; but to crucify the flesh with its lusts and desires, is pleasing to God, 1 Cor. iv. 8; Gal. v. 24.

RIEGER:—The higher blessing bestowed on our age is to be sought not in doing away but in fulfilling the commandments.

HEUBNER:—A survey of the institutions of the Old Testament is not without utility to the Christian; it shows him the prerogatives which he possesses, *viz.*, no longer merely the shadow, but real, essential blessings.—The whole ancient world is crying out after a Reconciler; the modern world will not have Him.—In Christianity lies the germ of the general improvement and perfection of the entire condition of humanity.—The tranquillizing of the conscience is the end of all sacrifices. The more the conscience was awakened, the less could sacrifices appease and satisfy it.

II.

Perfect communion with God is rendered possible by the perfect mediatorship of Jesus Christ, on the ground of a real expiation.

CHAPTER IX. 11-15.

11 But Christ being come [coming forward[1], *παραγενόμενος*] a high priest of [the] good
things to come, by a [by means of the *διὰ τῆς*] greater and more perfect tabernacle,
not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building [world, or creation, *κτίσεως*];
12 Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he [*om.* he] entered in
once [for all] into the holy place, having obtained [obtaining] eternal redemption *for*
13 *us* [*om. for us*]. For if the blood of bulls and goats [goats and bulls],[2] and the ashes
of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying [in respect to the
14 purity] of the flesh, How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the
[an] eternal[3] Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your [our][4] conscience
15 from dead works to serve the living God? And for this cause he is the mediator
of the [a] new testament [covenant] that by means of death [a death taking
place] for the redemption of the transgressions *that were* under the first testament
[covenant], they which are [have been] called might [may] receive the promise of
the eternal inheritance [*or*, those called to the eternal inheritance may receive the
promise].

[1] Ver. 11.—Lachmann's reading *γενομένων* instead of *μελλόντων* is not sufficiently vouched for by B. D*., although followed by Chrys., Œcum., Ital. Pesh. Philox.

[2] [Ver. 13—*τράγων καὶ ταύρων*, *goats and bulls* instead of *bulls and goats*, is the reading of A. B. D. Sin., *etc.*—K.].

[3] Ver. 14.—The reading of the Vulg. *πνεύματος ἁγίου*, found in D*., and in many minusc., is only an *interpretation*. In the Cod. Sin. it appears only as a correction.

[4] Ver. 14.—Instead of the Rec. *ὑμῶν*, we are to read after A. D*. K., 44, 47, 67, *ἡμῶν*. The Rec. has, however, the sanction of the Cod. Sin.

[Ver. 11.—*χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος*, *but Christ coming forward, presenting himself*, *i. e.*, appearing upon the stage of history, Matth. iii. 1, *etc.*—*τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν*, *of the future good things.*—*διὰ τῆς μείζ.*, *by means of the greater*, *etc.*, with def. article.—*οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως*, *not of this creation*, thus not *κοσμικόν*, *belonging to the world*. ver. 1.

Ver. 12.—*οὐδὲ δι' αἵματος*, *nor*, or, *and not by or through the blood:* not "*neither* by the blood."—*εἰσῆλθεν*. *entered;* the pron. *he*, of the Eng. ver., is not needed, *χριστός* is the subject.—*εὑράμενος*, not *having procured* (as if *εὑρημένος*), but *procuring;* his "procuring" is represented as coincident with, and in fact conditioned upon his entering. The added *for us*, of the Eng. ver. (especially standing where it does), is unnecessary and enfeebling. The emphasis is on *αἰωνίαν*, ETERNAL.

Ver. 13.—*τοὺς κεκοινωμένους*, *those who have been defiled.*—*πρὸς τὴν σαρκὸς καθαρότητα*, *in reference to the purity of the flesh.*

Ver. 14.—*καθαριεῖ*, *shall cleanse*, with reference to *καθαρότητα*, *cleanness* above.—*εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν*, *into or unto our serving*—in order that we may serve.

Ver. 15.—*διαθ. καινῆς*, of a (not, *the*) *new covenant*—*θανάτου γενομένου*, *a death taking place.*—*οἱ κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰων. κλήρον.* Moll constructs: "the called ones of the eternal inheritance," as Thol., Ebr., and some older expositors. Alford objects that thus *κληρονομία*, which receives "the stress, as being presently taken up in the next verse, would hardly be introduced in the most insignificant place possible. as a mere adjunct to the description of the subject of the sentence." But the stress seems not upon *κληρονομίας*, but rather on the *eternal* (as contradistinguishing the character of the New Covenant inheritance from that of the Old), and partly also upon the *λάβωσιν*, *may receive*, in order to characterize the New Covenant, as one under which, by the death of the great sacrificial victim. the called ones *receive* that inheritance which had before been only promised. And so in the verses following, it is not the *κληρονομία*, that is dwelt upon, but the connection between the *death* of the testator (the *θανάτου γενομένου*). and the *obtaining* of the promised inheritance. The real objection to the construction in question (adopted by Moll, Tholuck, Ebrard, Luther, the Peshito, *etc.*), is that, although not without examples, especially in Greek poetic diction, it has no warrant elsewhere in the usage of the author, and is rather too harsh to be assumed without necessity.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 11.—**But Christ coming forward,** *etc.*—*Παραγενόμενος* is used with reference to a historical appearance or advent, 1 Macc. iv. 46; Matth. iii. 1; Luke xii. 51. But had he had in mind the entrance of Christ upon His heavenly priesthood, he would have employed *γενόμενος*, ch. i. 4; vi. 20; vii. 26. Still the words are not to be referred to His incarnation, but to His actual appearance as matter of historical fact, in the character and function immediately designated. For the words *ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν*, are not to be separated by a comma from *παραγέν.* (Beng., Griesb.) and not to be resolved into *εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἀρχιερέα*, but to be taken as predicate. But the *τὰ ἀγαθά good things* are not styled *future* (*μελλ. to come*), as being future to the believers of the Old Test., but as belonging to the *οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα* ch. ii. 5, the *αἰὼν μέλλων*, ch. vi. 5, the *μέλλουσα πόλις* ch. xiii. 14.

By means of the greater and more perfect tabernacle, *etc.*—With Primas., Luth. and others we connect the much-vexed words διὰ τῆς μείζονος—κτίσεως immediately with the preceding, which we, however, construct as in apposition to Χριστός. Hofm. extends this connection clear to αἵματος, but the majority of interpreters make both dependent on εἰσῆλθεν, and commonly refer the "greater tabernacle" to the *heavens*, through which Christ passed into the inner sanctury, as God's real dwelling-place, as the earthly high-priest passed through the outer tabernacle. Undoubtedly, διά may denote in the one case the *local* place and way, in the other the *means whereby* Christ entered into the Holiest of all. Nor does the repeated declaration of Scripture that *the hands of God* formed and stretched out the heavens, forbid our inferring that the heavens could be here meant, on the ground that the tabernacle is here designated as "not made with hands." For this we might appeal to v. 24, where heaven is contrasted with the Mosaic sanctuary, and this latter is called in the contrast χειροποίητα. Nor need we again, if we adopt this view, restrict ourselves to the mere material heaven of clouds, but might refer the words to the invisible worlds, the dwelling-place of angels and of the blessed, which, as a tabernacle not made with hands, are contrasted with the hand-wrought tabernacle of Moses. In favor of this too is the emphatic heightening of the import of the term χειροποιήτου by the appended οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως. For we must conceive these supramundane heavens as God's creation and work, but not belonging to this perishable creation, with which we have immediately to do. And if we distinguish these supramundane, but still created heavens, in which are "many mansions," John xiv. 2, to which thus still a locality is ascribed, from the uncreated dwelling-place of God Himself, as the heaven exalted above all relations of time and space (Stier, Del.), then we could not charge on the view under consideration the objection urged by Beza: "*perabsurde diceretur per cælum ingressus esse in cælum.*" But, after all, this interpretation furnishes no proper point of comparison between heaven and the outer tabernacle. For this tabernacle was not a *mere passage-way* to an interior locality; and we again see no object in so detailed and elaborate a description. This studious elaborateness is decidedly at war with Tholuck's idea that the representation of the lower heavens is but as it were a mere foil to the conception of the heavenly holy of holies. Still less can we understand by the outer tabernacle, the world in general (Justiniani, Carpz.) in which case we should have to render "not of this mode of building," *i. e.*, not like the tabernacle of Moses; which false translation, with a different conception of the meaning, is given by Erasm., Luth., Beng., and others. With just as little reason finally can the words be applied (with reference to ch. x. 20; John i. 14) to the *body of Christ*, whether it be understood of His *human nature* (Chrys., Primas., Calv., Bez., Grot., Est., Beng. and others), or of His holy life in the flesh (Ebr.), or of His glorified body (Hofm.), or of His mystical body the church militant on earth (Cajet., Calov, Braun, Ramb., *etc.*). We get under each explanation either an unnatural idea, or an unnatural parallel, even though we take the first διά not locally but instrumentally; or we subject the words to a sense which they will not bear. For σκηνή may indeed denote the *body*, but scarcely life in the body, or the sacrifice of the body, or the glorified body. To the sinlessness and holiness of Christ the phrase cannot refer; for the high-priest attained these not in the outer sanctuary, but only in the most holy place by the sprinkling of the blood of the heifer. To me the very contrast presented with the purely symbolical and typical nature of the old covenant, a nature illustrated in the character of the Mosaic tabernacle by the Holy Spirit Himself, seems utterly to exclude the carrying over of the distinction of a hither and inner tabernacle to the New Testament dispensation, and to this the figurative language here used has exclusive reference. I regard, therefore, σκηνή as a designation of the tabernacle in general, and prefer the perfectly simple explanation previously touched upon (at viii. 2), which is supported by the very arrangement of the words, and corroborated by the much more natural force thus given to οὐδέ. The manner in which Christ has become a high-priest is here not in the slightest degree in question: the author is simply setting forth the fact that, by His high-priesthood, not a symbolical, but a *true and actual* reconciliation with God has been effected. He is a high-priest, not of the earthly, but, as has been already shown by the author, of the heavenly tabernacle. This heavenly sanctuary which ch. viii. 2 he called σκηνὴ ἀληθινή, *genuine tabernacle*, of which Christ is λειτουργός, he here styles the better and more perfect tabernacle, which he characterizes as that not built by hands, *i. e.*, founded indeed, but not belonging to this world, by means of which Christ has historically appeared and exists as high-priest of the good things to come, in the same way as the Jewish high-priest, by means of the Mosaic tabernacle, became the priest of symbolical and typical blessings. In accordance with this, or as such, has He *also not* (οὐδέ) by means of the blood of goats entered into the holy place, which corresponds to the holiest of all, or the dwelling-place of God. Εὑράμενος is the second Aorist (formed in imitation of the first Aorist (which Alexandrine peculiarity became, by means of the Sept., an ordinary Hellenistic usage), and coincides in time with that of the finite verb [*i. e.*, not *having procured*, but *procuring*]. The feminine formation αἰωνία is found in the New Test. only here, and 2 Thes. ii. 16.

[There is no point, in my opinion, in which Moll has shown sounder judgment as an interpreter than in the clear and simple way in which he has here (as at ch. viii. 2) brushed aside the numerous vagaries and conceits in which eminent expositors have indulged regarding the heavenly tabernacle. Christ's holy life on earth, His sacrifice on the cross, His earthly human body, His heavenly glorified body, the lower local heavens, the heaven of the angels and glorified saints, have all been made to answer to the outer tabernacle, *through* which the Saviour past into the inner sanctuary. The lower local heavens, as being those through which Christ

actually did pass, is the only one of these that does not at once strike one as purely arbitrary and capricious; and these heavens stand in no conceivable relation to the proper *significance* of the outer tabernacle. This, as Moll justly remarks, was no *mere passage-way* into the holiest of all, but stood with its own expressive import, and as a theatre of constant priestly service. The other meanings too are such as could only by the harshest straining of terms, be called a tabernacle, or as utterly fail of correspondence to the idea of the outer tabernacle of Moses. The language of the author at first view, indeed, seems to favor this distinction of the two tabernacles. Christ, he says, entered *διὰ τῆς σκηνῆς*, into the sanctuary. It is natural here to interpret *διά locally*, and to think, therefore, of the Levitical high-priests passing through the outer into the inner tabernacle, and thus to make *διὰ τῆς σκηνῆς* here analogous to the former. But against it there are several serious objections, as would be readily conjectured by one who considers the numerous and widely diverse and discordant opinions regarding the nature and significance of this outer tabernacle through which the heavenly high-priest passed. These objections are chiefly four: *First*, the outer tabernacle of Moses is not represented as a mere place for *passing through*, but as a place of constant priestly service; and although the high-priest must have past through it when he entered the holy of holies, yet that is a mere incident upon which no stress is laid, which the author does not even mention, and of which he does not appear to have thought. It is not supposable, therefore, that he would have selected as a prominent feature of Christ's entrance into the heavenly Sanctuary, that which it had not even occurred to him to mention with reference to the earthly. *Secondly*, there *is* in the figurative tabernacle of the New Testament no outer sanctuary. There cannot be any. There is no place for it. The outer Sanctuary of the Mosaic tabernacle stood as the "emblem for the time then existing," the Holy Ghost signifying, while that anterior tabernacle yet had place, that the way into the holiest of all had not been yet made manifest. There is here a most explicit and unmistakable declaration on the subject. The outer Mosaic tabernacle stood as the symbol of imperfection, of distance from God—of approach to Him only typically, but not really effected. With the rending of the veil of the temple at the death of Christ, that distinction between outer and inner tabernacle disappeared for ever. Unless, therefore, we are willing to reverse the author's entire doctrine, and maintain that the sacrifice of Christ has not fulfilled what was before symbolized, producing *a real approach* to God, and converting the whole Christian body into a "royal priesthood," we must concede that there is and can be in the New Testament arrangements nothing answering to the outer tabernacle of Moses. *Thirdly*, in perfect correspondence with this is the brief but emphatic and striking description which the author gives of this *σκηνή*, through which Christ passed into the Sanctuary on high. It is "the greater and more perfect tabernacle" —"not made with hands," *i. e.*, not "of this material creation." This clearly stands in antithesis, not to a part of the tabernacle of Moses, but to the whole of it. That was typical; this is *ἀληθινή*, the genuine archetypal tabernacle. That was *κοσμική*, *belonging to the world*, material, made with hands: this is heavenly, spiritual, not made with hands, not of this creation. These epithets and descriptive phrases, which would have no significance as referring to the outer Mosaic tabernacle, are strikingly pertinent as referring to it as a whole, and as characterizing the archetypal, true, heavenly, greater, and more perfect tabernacle, in which the New Testament high-priest ministers in distinction from the worldly, typical, material tabernacle of the Levitical priesthood. *Fourthly*, with this view, and only with this, the author's parallel becomes complete. The parallel has reference to two points, the tabernacle, in which the respective priests ministered, and the offerings which they brought. The Levitical priest ministered in the earthly, worldly, typical tabernacle, and brought into it the blood of bulls and goats; Christ ministers in the heavenly, spiritual, archetypal tabernacle, and His offering is *His own blood*. The *διά* may, in both cases, be taken instrumentally; or in the first locally, and the second instrumentally: the author having his mind on the fact, that in the tabernacle the priest did really pass through a considerable portion of it before reaching the *adytum*, and transferring the same imagery to the skies.—K].

VER. 13. **The ashes of an heifer,** *etc.*—Besides the expiatory offering, the author mentions the rite of purification, by which those contaminated by contact with dead bodies, *i. e.*, persons and utensils that had become Levitically unclean, might, by means of spring water mingled with the ashes of a red, spotless heifer, burnt outside of the court, sprinkled upon them with a hyssop branch, become again Levitically clean (Num. xix.). It is better, with Erasm., Bez., *etc.*, to connect *τοὺς κεκοινωμένους* with *ῥαντίζουσα*, which requires an object, than with *ἁγιάζει* (Vulg., Luth., Calv., Beng.), which may easily stand absolutely, and differs essentially from *ἁγνίζει*.

VER. 14. **By means of an eternal Spirit.**—The words *διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου* belong as well to *ἄμωμον* as to *προσήνεγκεν*, which, however, belongs not to the offering of the blood poured out upon the earth in the inner sanctuary (Socin., Schlicht., Grot., Limb., Bl., in part Riehm), but, as shown by the technical expressions, to the offering on the cross. Nor is the *πνεῦμα αἰων.* identical with the *δύναμις ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου*, ch. vii. 16 (Socin., Schlicht., Grot., Limb., Carpz., Riehm, Reuss), but its *cause;* nor does it apply either to Christ's glorified condition after His exaltation (Döder., Storr), nor to the spirit of the law in contrast with its letter (Michael.), nor to the spirit of prophecy in the prophets (Planck). It is undoubtedly by design that the Holy Spirit Himself is not expressly named, and the absence of the article implies that the noun is to be taken generically (Lün.) as Rom. i. 8. But it must be still referred, as to the matter of fact, to the Holy Spirit dwelling in Christ, and not to the divine nature of Christ (Bez., Calov, Bisp., *etc.*), or to the Spirit of God that made Christ a living man (Hofm.), or to His

divine personality (Del.). But this view, which brings into clear relief the *ethical* features of Christ's sacrifice of Himself, is by Bleek, De Wette, and others, raised into undue prominence, while others, again, with Este, refer the words too exclusively to the Third Person of the Trinity. The author, on the contrary, is laying stress, on the spiritual power of the offering of Christ, as an unblemished and spotless mediator, in its attribute of *eternal*. In this epithet is, of course, then implied a contrast. It implies, however, not a contrast with the *fire* which consumed the Levitical offerings (Chrys., Œc., Theophyl., *etc.*); nor with the perishing animal soul in the blood of the sacrificial victim (Hofm., Del.), inasmuch as it is not the offering itself that is secured by the agency of this Eternal Spirit, but the atoning efficacy of the blood, a fact which RIEHM II. 527 *Anmerk*, appears to overlook. The words rather express a contrast with that which originates and perishes in time; and they bring the offering of Christ upon the cross into immediate dependence upon the ministry of a Spirit whose agency for this purpose at once reaches back into the eternity of the past, and carries its influence forward into the eternity of the future. Tholuck regards the words as expressing a contrast with the fleshly character of the law, taking with Fritzsche the διά to denote not so much condition as the sphere, in which the offering takes place; thus, "in a true and eternal manner" (similarly Socin. and Beng.). The ἔργα νεκρά are not sinful, and hence death-bringing actions, but the works of the law which, as they have in themselves no life, so produce no life, comp. ch. vi. 1.

VER. 15. **And for this reason he is mediator of a new covenant,** *etc.*—Διὰ τοῦτο is to be referred, not to what follows, merely anticipating the ὅπως (Schlicht., Bl., Ebr., *etc.*), but in view of the close connection with the preceding, to the whole train of thought, vv. 9–14, not specially to αἷμα (Sykes, Chr. F. Schmid). The final clause, ὅπως, *etc.*, gives not so much the goal to which, according to the divine counsel, the New Covenant was to lead, and with this the way and means by which the attainment of this goal should be accomplished (Lün.), as the purpose of God to bring by the way that has been described, those who have been called to the eternal inheritance into the fruition of the promise. We are certainly not to connect εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν with λάβωσιν, but, as a clause denoting object and purpose, with θανάτου γενομένου. But to connect τῆς κληρον. with ἐπαγγ. (Erasm., Luth., Calv., Bl., De W., Lün., Hofm., Del.), though intrinsically possible, is less natural than with the immediately preceding κεκλημένοι (Pesh., Thol., Ebr., Riehm, *etc.*), inasmuch as the called here are not *Christians* as such (κλητοί) or exclusively, but also according to v. 26 and ch. xi. 39, 40, embrace the believers of the Old Testament, and the word, therefore, seems to need a qualifying addition. The λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπαγγ. occurs also, ch. xi. 13; Acts ii. 33, of the reception of the *substance* of the promise, as κληρονομεῖν τὴν ἐπαγγ. ch. vi. 12, 17; ἐπιτυχεῖν τῆς ἐπαγγ. ch. vi. 15; κομίσασθαι τὴν ἐπαγγ. ch. x. 36; xi. 39. The importance to the following discussion of the idea of that *inheritance* (κληρονομία), which even in the Old Testament is promised, and by the counsel of God designed for all the members of the covenant people, but into whose possession the κεκλημένοι can enter only by means of a new διαθήκη, renders it natural even here to link with the διαθήκη the idea of a *testament*. Since, however, this signification develops itself only from the connection of the following verses, it is more appropriate, in this introductory sentence, to use a word which, like διαθήκη, can admit, according to the exigency, of being specialized either into covenant or testament.—LÖFFLER (*on the Church Doctrine of Satisfaction*), BRETSCHN. (*Dogmatic* II. § 155), and Reiche at Rom. (iii. 25) regard the idea as expressed that the reconciliation refers only to sins committed before the transition to Christianity. But Calvin says rightly: *non quæ tempore Vet. Test. commissæ, sed quæ Vet. Test. vigore manebant irremissæ;* and Tholuck remarks how it springs from the train of thought that only he who stands in the New Covenant, can have continually and forever the consolation of feeling the sense of guilt completely done away.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Christ has, indeed, *historically*, that is to say, *in time* and *on earth*, appeared as a High-priest, but on the one hand His priesthood is not merely the fulfilment of the *Aaronic*, but also of the *Melchisedec* type; and, on the other, the sanctuary, of which He is High-priest in *both relations*, is not the earthly sanctuary, reared by human hands after a divinely indicated pattern, and by its typical and symbolical character destined to pass away; but the sanctuary belonging to the heavenly world, *imperishable* and *opening the way* to the *fulfilment* of all the promises of God. The same character is, for this reason, also borne by all the good things of which Christ, as High-priest, is mediator.

2. In the *ritual* of the Old Testament there lies between the means and the result no internal and essential connection. That which unites the two, is merely a divine ordination. But on account of the *covenant relation*, the Israelites in believing obedience to God, yielded themselves to this ordination, and in carrying out its requirements received from it a blessing. Still, the whole bore merely *the stamp of externality*, alike in the means and in the result, and also in the union of atonement, cleansing and sanctification.

3. In the New Covenant, also, *expiation*, *cleansing*, *sanctification*, are still distinguished, but are at the same time internally and essentially united. The same blood of Christ, which *objectively expiates*, *subjectively purifies* the moral consciousness, so that the consequence of this *redemption* is a priestly *service*, in which the ransomed one no longer in individual rites and under the compulsion of the law, but with his whole person, by means of the new spirit, is *sanctified*, and henceforth continually *sanctifying* himself for the living God.

4. Precisely the same remark applies to the *features of the sacrifice of Christ*, which latter stands not in an outward relation and one merely approved and determined by God, but in an in-

ternal and essential relation to this result as the *alone sufficient*, and *eternally efficacious* means of accomplishing the divine purpose of redemption. For Christ has offered *Himself*, and that as a *spotless* and *blameless* victim in the sense of the High-priestly *sacrifice*, and all this has been effected through the instrumentality of an *Eternal Spirit*.

5. There is, indeed, a *ransom* and a *redemption*, in a more general sense, as simple *deliverance;* but taken in connection with high-priestly arrangements, we must here adhere to the more specific sense of "ransoming" or freeing, by the *payment of a ransom-price*. This ransom-price is the *blood* of Christ as of an entirely spotless lamb, 1 Pet. i. 19; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14, and is here, as always, in Scripture, designated as a price divinely offered; so that the idea of the ransom price as paid to Satan (Origen, Basil, and others till St. Bernhard) is to be totally rejected. It can, indeed, be said that Christ has been made unto us of God redemption, 2 Cor. i. 30. But this expression merely gives prominence to the divine agency alike in the sending of Christ into the world, and particularly in the work of redemption, and points at the same time to the acceptance on the part of God, of the ransom which has been paid. In that we have been sold under sin, Rom. vii. 14, we have become helpless victims of the *wrath*, or *avenging justice of God*. Against this we are, according to the Hebrew mode of expression, *covered* by the blood shed for us, which, as *sacrificial blood*, has an *expiatory significance*. The redemption can thus, on the one hand, be conceived as the payment of a כֹּפֶר, *i. e.*, λύτρωσις; on the other as a כַּפָּרָה, *i. e.*, ἱλασμός. It is invariably effected by means of a *substitutionary satisfaction*, and by a *perfectly valid expiation*.

6. The efficacious element in the blood lies not in its matter or substance, but the *life which moves in it, and which, by means of a special act, not connected with the course of nature, has been yielded up to death*, Lev. xvii. 11. Since, then, the crucifixion of Christ falls not under the category of the slaughter of an innocent person, or of the murder, for the ends of justice, of a righteous man, but under that of the surrendering up of His own person at once freely and in accordance with the purpose of God, Tit. ii. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 5, the significance, power and efficacy of this death must correspond entirely with the *peculiar nature and dignity of the person of Jesus Christ*. He Himself, however, expressly indicates, Matth. xx. 28, His death as *the substitutionary offering of a ransom-price*. On account of the nature of His person, consequently, this vicariousness must be complete, the satisfaction all sufficient, the ransom actual and eternal. As against the false and distorted interpretations of Hofmann, see Delitzsch's *Second Appendix* "on the firm Scriptural basis for the Church doctrine of vicarious satisfaction" (in his Commentary, p. 708 ff.).

7. The sacrifice of Christ is also not compared with the human sacrifices of the heathen, but is brought into direct relation with the high-priestly expiatory offering ordained by God, as being the accomplishment of its type, and the realization of its symbol. In this very fact lies the certainty that the relation of God to this offering is neither that of mere *passive permission*, nor that of Divine wrath quenched in the *blood* of *human sacrifices*, nor that of any *caprice* or *unrighteousness* on the part of God in His acceptance of this sacrifice, and holding the substitution as valid. This becomes perfectly clear, if we regard, on the one hand, the *position of Christ* alike in reference to God and to mankind, and, on the other, His *relation to the Spirit of God*.

8. It is not enough to bring into prominence the thoroughly *moral* character of the sacrifice of Christ; neither is it sufficient to lay stress on the *religious* purity and acceptableness in the sight of God of this act, with its moving grounds and impelling causes. In this case we should merely have a sacrifice accomplished such as, in respect of conscientiousness, love of truth, zealous faith, and fidelity of compassion, all true Christians are enabled by the influences of the Holy Spirit to accomplish in a death by martyrdom. We have to do with *a movement and working of the Spirit in Christ*, which has its *ground* and *beginning* not within the limits of *time* and of *humanity*, and thus with a sacrifice freely determined upon in eternity, and accomplished within the limits of time in perfect unity with the eternal Spirit, who works perpetually through Christ's whole career of life and suffering—a sacrifice which, precisely for this reason, has a world-embracing and ever-during significance, and has become the *means* of the establishment of *a new covenant*.

9. On the basis, and under the authority of the Mosaic law and worship, there was indeed a *calling to the eternal inheritance* of the children of God; but the promised inheritance could not be received, because the *law* was able only to sharpen the consciousness of guilt, and with this the sense of deserved punishment and death, while the *ritual* could, in its turn, produce only, as a Levitical purification, a typical redemption, a merely symbolical approach to God. It was only through the truly expiatory death of the God-man, who expiated, suffered and died, not for Himself, but vicariously, and rendered satisfaction not merely to the righteousness, but to the punitive righteousness of God, *that a change was wrought in the entire relation of humanity to God, and a real taking away of man's guilty condition and relations became possible*.

10. All this mirrors itself indeed in human feelings, experiences, and testimonies, and finds in them expression; but it has its *ground* in no human conditions and conceptions, but in the arrangements and promises of God. The necessary consequence of the death of Jesus Christ is, therefore, *a new covenant;* so that this death is not merely the antitype of the High-priestly offering of atonement, but also, of the Paschal Lamb, 2 Cor. v. 7, and, as is immediately intimated in what follows by the author of our Epistle, is the antitype of the covenant sacrifice, Ex. xxiv., whereby Israel, sprinkled by the blood of atonement, was dedicated as the people of God, and as a royal priesthood (Lev. viii.).

11. The death of Christ is, in its significance in sacred history, just as little to be conceived apart from the *glorification of the Royal Priest* enthroned at the right hand of God, which followed upon His resurrection and ascension, as

from the *perfected life* of the Incarnate One, which was secured by His obedience and sufferings. In the passage before us, however, these intermediate and conditioning acts are merely indicated, and not brought into prominence. The emphasis lies rather on the fact that the accomplished entrance of Christ into the heavenly sanctuary accomplished once and for ever, in that it wrought *eternal* redemption, had its ground and efficiency in His own blood, and for this reason infinitely transcends its one-sided and shadowy type in the expiatory rites of the Old Covenant.

12. It is only by a reference to the High-priestly offering of atonement, that an emphasis is laid upon the *blood* (see particularly chap. xiii. 11). Elsewhere an offering of the *body* is also mentioned (chap. x. 10), but, of course, comprehending this, in that Christ is said to have offered up *Himself* (ch. vii. 26; ix. 14, 25; Eph. v. 2); since we have to do with the full and undivided person of the Redeemer, alike in His earthly and His glorified state. At all events, our author is not chargeable with that sensuous mode of conception and expression employed by the Socinians, which characterizes the school of Bengel and Höttinger, and has been followed by Stier, and, in part, by Hofmann—a mode of expression which, while unduly pressing the analogy of the earthly high-priest's proceedings in the act of expiation, is fraught with misconceptions, false assumptions, and dangerous consequences. It assumes that the blood of sprinkling (ch. x. 22; xii. 24) is even in heaven a separate thing, existing beside the glorified but bloodless body of the exalted Redeemer. Quenstädt has strikingly expressed the correct view, while Calov, on the other hand, has indulged in many sensuous representations, and in an undue admixture of merely sensuous and poetic with dogmatic elements.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The *perfection of the mediatorship* of Jesus Christ consists in the perfection: 1, of the *sanctuary* in which He exercises His office; 2, of the *office* which He exercises; 3, of the sacrifice which He has offered; 4, of the covenant which He established; 5, of the blessings which He procures.—The *power of the blood* of Jesus Christ: *a.* whence it springs; *b.* what it accomplishes; *c.* how it is appropriated.—The *death* of Jesus Christ as a High-priestly *sacrifice*—*The nature, the causes, and the effects* of the sacrifice offered by Jesus Christ.—We are *redeemed*: 1, from what? 2, by what? 3, for what?—The *purging of our conscience: a.* in its *necessity; b.* in its *means; c.* in its *consequences.*—The *consequences* of Christ's offering of Himself are: 1, His *entrance* into the heavenly sanctuary; 2, an *eternal* redemption; 3, the *New* Covenant.—What *defiles* and what *purifies* us.—Redeemed by Christ, we yet cannot do whatever we would; we are members of the New *Covenant.*—The *New Covenant* in: 1, its object; 2, its foundation; 3, its means.—The death of Christ is the *most perfect* offering: 1, as an offering of Himself; 2, as a sin-offering; 3, as a cleansing offering; 4, as a covenant offering; 5, as a peace-offering.—The *Redemption* through Jesus Christ is: 1, an *eternal* one; 2, a *complete* one.—We have in our redemption to look: 1, at the *Mediator*, who has procured it; 2, at the *price* which it has cost; 3, at the *gain* which it has secured; 4, at the *covenant* which it has established; 5, at the *end* which it proposes.

STARKE:—Saviours [healers] and redeemers [ransomers] from bodily needs are distinguishable; but Jesus is the true *Saviour*, who saves us even from our sins; He alone has procured an eternal *redemption.*—Grand redemption of the human race! The Son of God Himself has redeemed us by His own blood.—The blood of Christ is a free, public boundary fixed against sin.—How heavy, great and dreadful must our sins be in the sight of God! They are assuredly dead works, which bring not only temporal, but also eternal death.—A believer may indulge in defiance and glorying against the Devil. Out of Christ I am to and in myself a sinner; In Christ I am a sinner no longer.—The atoning sacrifice of the Lord Jesus is efficacious not only for the future, but for the past; for the believers of the Old as well as of the New Testament.—Many children of the world imagine that they are able to live well and rightly before others, when behold, their works are purely dead works, which spring from a heart spiritually dead, and lead to eternal death. Matth. xxiii. 27; Rev. iii. 1.

RIEGER:—Purification and propitiation comprehend God's entire work of rescuing from sin. 1 John ii. 2; Col. i. 14, 22.—With the plague of an evil conscience, or with the halting movements of an unpurified conscience, there is no service acceptable to the living God.

MENKEN:—The way into the holiest of all was no path of pleasure pursued by self-will and self-glorification; but a path of the deepest self-abasement, which, through the Eternal Spirit, offered itself unto the uttermost before God.—The New Testament is nothing but the history of the fulfilment of the Divine promise, and thus the history of the appearance of the Promised One, and along with this, the history of an *accomplished*, the announcement of an *existing*, reconciliation of the world with God.

HEUBNER:—The infinite value of the reconciliation wrought by Christ: 1. In the way and manner in which it has been made; *a.* as an immediate propitiation of God in the sanctuary of God; *b.* by Christ's offering of Himself. 2. In the effects of this reconciliation, since *a.* it purifies the conscience; *b.* gives power for a holy life; *c.* has established God's covenant with men, so that they now have full entrance into life.

TEXTOR:—(*Epistolary Sermons*, 1858). The high-priestly office of Jesus Christ: 1. how this is already prefigured in the Old Testament; 2. how Jesus Christ has exercised it; 3. the benefit which it brings us.

FRICKE:—The blood of Jesus Christ purifies 1. the conscience; 2. from dead works; 3. to serve the living God.

L. HARMS:—(At Hermannsburg): The heavenly high-priesthood of our Lord Jesus on the new earth: 1. His Church; 2. the altar; 3. the congregation (1863).

III.

In the concluding of this New Covenant the blood of Christ was indispensable.

CHAPTER IX. 16–22.

16 For where a testament *is*, there must also of necessity be [be adduced or declared,
17 φέρεσθαι] the death of the testator. For a testament *is* of force after men are dead:
otherwise it is of no strength at all [since it scarcely is of any force] while the testa-
18 tor liveth. Whereupon [whence, ὅθεν] neither [not even, οὐδέ][1] the first *testament*
19 was [has been] dedicated [inaugurated] without blood. For when Moses had spoken
every precept to all the people according to the[2] law, he took the blood of calves and
of goats,[3] with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled[4] both the book [it-
20 self, αὐτό] and all the people, Saying, This *is* the blood of the testament [or, cove-
21 nant] which God hath [*om.* hath] enjoined unto you. Moreover [And] he sprinkled
likewise with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry [service].
22 And almost [pretty nearly, *or* about, σχεδόν] all things are by the law purged with
blood; and without shedding of blood is [there takes place] no remission.

[1] Ver. 18.—Instead of οὐδ᾽ A. C. D. E. L., 4, 44, 55 (but not the Sin.), write οὐδέ.
[2] Ver. 19.—The article before νόμον is vouched for by A. C. D*. L., 21, 47, 71. In the Sin. it comes from a second hand.
[3] Ver. 19.—The Art. before τράγων is required by Sin. A. C. D. E., 80.
[4] Ver. 19.—For ἐῤῥάντισε all the Uncial MSS. have ἐράντισεν.

[Ver. 16.—φέρεσθαι, not *be*, as E. V., but, *adduced, declared*, Alf., *implied;* Words., *brought to pass;* many, *afferri coram judice*, of establishing judicially; Moll renders "*beigebracht werden.*"

Ver. 17.—ἐπὶ νεκροῖς, *over the dead, in case of the dead*, lit., on condition of persons as dead.—ἐπεί μήποτε elegantly softening and appealing rather to the judgment of the reader; "for look whether perchance it has force;" see if it be not perhaps invalid. It is by no means intensive, as in the E. V., "it has no force at all." Otherwise it should be taken as a question: "*Since does it at all=it does not at all, does it?*"

Ver. 18.—ὅθεν, *whence*, logical.—οὐδέ., *not even.*—ἐγκεκαίνισται, Perf., *has been inaugurated*, not, *was dedicated.* The Perf. implies that it stands before our eyes.

Ver. 19.—λαληθείσης γάρ, *for after every commandment was spoken, etc.*—αὐτό τε τὸ βιβλίον, *both the book itself.*

Ver. 20.—ἐνετείλατο, Aor., *enjoined*, not, *hath enjoined.*

Ver. 21.—καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν δέ, *and the tabernacle too;* so καί—δέ, constantly and elegantly used in Greek. Not quite as in E. V. and Alf., *and moreover.*

Ver. 22.—καὶ σχεδόν, and *pretty much, pretty nearly, as one might say.* It does not like our *almost* (Gr. ὀλίγου δεῖν) positively exclude a part, but simply declines to guarantee the exact accuracy of the statement. *Almost*, therefore, is never its proper rendering. Alf. renders *almost*, but adds parenthetically, *one may say that*, which is sufficiently exact.—αἱματεκχυσία, either *shedding of blood* in the slaughter of the victim, or *pouring out of the blood* of the victim when slaughtered; the former here seems more probable. Αἱματεκ., "seems to be a word coined by the sacred writer, to express his meaning." ALF.—γίνεται, *takes place.*—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 16. **For where a testament is**, *etc.*—Attempts have been very naturally made (springing from the ὅθεν of ver. 18, and the γάρ connecting this verse with ver. 15), to take διαθήκη here in its ordinary sense of *covenant* (*Crit. Sacr.*, VII. 2 p., 1067 sq., Seb. Schmidt, Michaelis, Cramer, Ebrard, *etc.*). They are convicted at once, however, of error, by the utter falseness of the idea that in the formation of a *covenant* the death of Him who framed it is indispensable to its validity, as well as by the intolerable harshness of any other mode of explaining ὁ διαθέμενος. For although ἐπὶ νεκροῖς might indeed denote "over slaughtered sacrificial victims," inasmuch as in later usage τὸ νεκρόν, is frequently=τὸ πτῶμα,—it is impossible that ὁ διαθέμενος can be applied either to the *animal offered* in sacrifice in confirmation of the covenant, or to the *man* regarded as replaced and *represented* by the victim, and thus pledging himself as it were to a moral death, or to the *mediator* of the covenant. If, on the other hand, in allusion to the above mentioned *inheritance* (κληρονομία), we evolve here out of the more general signification of διαθήκη (*arrangement, dispositio*) the more special one of *testamentary arrangement, testament*, we must beware of extending the application of the comparison made in illustration of the thought, beyond the immediate sentiment and purpose of the writer, and thus of introducing alien and incongruous elements into the passage. Such is the idea advanced by Menken, who says (*Homilies on Chapters IX. and X.*, p. 142) that only He who by His death has proved Himself worthy of the inheritance, could make others fellow-heirs with Him; as also that of Hofmann, who (*Weissag.* II., 165) appeals in proof of the necessity of the *death* of the ὁ διαθέμενος, to the fact that during His life He could *add* something to His possessions, and thus could not during His life-time make any one an heir of the whole property that He should leave behind Him. The question is not now of a setting forth of the *ultimate ground* of the death of Christ, a ground already assigned at ver. 15—but of an *illustration* of its

practical necessity, in order for the *delivering over* of the blessings of salvation, as an inheritance. Compare as to the idea, Luke xxii. 29: κἀγὼ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν καθὼς διέθετό μοι ὁ πατήρ μου βασιλείαν. Among the ancient Hebrews there were, it is true, no arbitrary testamentary bequests, Deut. xxi. 16. But among the later Jews they were by no means unknown (MICHAELIS, *Mos. Recht.* II., § 80), and the sentiment in question is conceived and expressed not from a Hebrew, but a Hellenic point of view. If we decline giving to φέρεσθαι the signification *adduced* (HOFM. *Schriftb.* II. 1, 428) or *endured* (referred by Wittich to the *relatives*), the most probable rendering will be that of *sermone ferri*=*constare* (Bretschn.). The *juristic* application of the word =*afferri coram judice* (Hammond, Elsner, and the majority, since Valckenaer) is restricted properly to the adducing of evidence in court, and applies not to the right of inheritance. The rendering *esse, extare*=γίγνεσθαι (*be* or *become*), which, with the ancients and up to the time of Valck., was the prevalent one, is held among later comm. only by Schultz and Böhme, and cannot be sustained. The rendering *expectari* (Grot.) is totally inadmissible. Grammatically indefensible too is the making μήποτε=μήπω, *not yet* (Vulg., Erasm., Luth., Schlicht., Böhme). In a strictly *objective* sentence we should indeed have expected οὐ; but the later writers in *causal* sentences with ὅτι and ἐπεί frequently confound οὐ and μή (MADVIG, *Synt.*, § 207, *Anm.* 2). If, with Winer, we decline ascribing to our author a negligence belonging properly to the vulgar idiom (MULLACH, *Gramm. der Griech. Vulgarsprache*, p. 29), but give to μή its subjective force, we must then (with Œc., Beng., Lachm., Hofm., Del., *etc.*) assume an *interrogation;* and this all the more, as ἐπεί, also at chap. x. 2; Rom. iii. 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 16; xv. 29; introduces a proof in the form of interrogation, and μήποτε appears alike in direct (John vii. 26) and indirect (Luke iii. 15; 2 Tim. ii. 25) interrogations. Quite unnecessarily ISIDOR. PELUS. (*Ep.* IV., 113) prefers the reading μὴ τότε found only in D*.

VER. 18. **Whence, also, neither has the first covenant,** *etc.*—The reference of ὅθεν to ver. 15 by putting vv. 16, 17, in parenthesis (Zachar., Mor., Storr, Heinr., Bisp.,) is inadmissible. The words κατὰ τὸν νόμον are not to be connected with πάσης ἐντολῆς=("Every commandment as contained in the law," (Schlicht., Calov, Beng., Bl., Bisp., *etc.*,) but with λαληθείσης, Œc., Erasm., Calv., Bez., Grot., *etc.*,); not, however, in the sense of "according to the command" in reference to the injunction, Ex. xx. 22, (Bez., etc.,) but, "in accordance with the law received on Sinai;" inasmuch as in concluding the covenant, an exact repetition of the divine commands was indispensable.

VER. 19. **He took the blood,** *etc.*—The καί after βιβλίον which we must not (with Colomes. and Valcken.) strike out, and which cannot possibly, with Beng., be taken as corresponding to the καὶ δέ of ver. 21, forbids our making αὐτὸ τὸ βιβ. dependent on λαβών. We are to assume here, as also in the mention of the *goats* which might be chosen for burnt offering, (Lev. i. 10 f.; iv. 23 f.; ix. 2 f.; Num. vi. 10 f.; vii. 27; comp. Ex. xxiv. 5); and were also used in the expiatory offerings mentioned in vv. 12, 13, and in like manner in respect to the *means of purification*, (which elsewhere are found only in the case of lepers, Lev. xiv., and those defiled by dead bodies, Num. xix.) an *expression* drawn from *tradition*, (and which, at least in respect to that which immediately follows, is also found in JOSEPH. *Antt.* III. 8, 6), of the event recorded, Ex. xxiv. In the citation we have τοῦτο instead of the ἰδού of the Sept., ὁ θεός instead of κύριος, and ἐνετείλατο instead of διέθετο.

VER. 21. **And the tabernacle, too.**—Since the tabernacle and vessels were constructed at a later period, the author cannot refer to anything that is *contemporaneous* with what is hitherto mentioned. To this fact points the *καὶ δέ*=*but also, on the other hand also.* The *anointing* is that enjoined, Ex. xl. 10, which is probably identical with that which was performed, Lev. viii. 10, during the seven days of priestly consecration, an account of which, similar to that here recorded, is given by Josephus, while the original text recounts only the sprinkling with oil, as of the positive means of *consecration*, but mentions the *purifying* by the blood of atonement only in reference to the altar, Lev. viii. 15, 19, 24.

VER. 22. **And all things, as one might say, are purified with blood,** *etc.*—Also, water and fire are a means of purification; but when the question is of forgiveness of sin, then *blood* is demanded, according to Lev. xvii. 11. The *vegetable* sin-offering of the poor, Lev. v. 11–13, forms no exception, but is a recognized substitute. Chrys., Primas., *etc.*, erroneously refer σχεδόν to καθαρίζεται as if expressing the imperfection of this purification, neither, however, does it belong to ἐν αἵματι, (Beng., Böhm.), but to πάντα. The word αἱματεκχυσία is understood by De W., Thol., Hofm., Keil, of the pouring out of blood on the altar, and the sprinkling, while Bl., Lün., Del., Kurtz, on the contrary, refer it to the *slaughter*, which is parallel to the death of Christ upon the cross. Del. recalls the language of the last Supper, Luke xxii. 20, as in point of symbol and of fact, furnishing the closest parallel, without yet being insensible to what, on purely archæological grounds, may be urged in favor of the former explanation (comp. EINHORN, *Prinzip des Mosaismus*, p. 82 ff.).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Even in the Old Test. the salvation promised by God to His people, under certain terms and conditions, appears as an inheritance. נַחֲלָה. It is thus not unscriptural, and not even surprising, but merely uncommon, when Christ, who previously was regarded as the accomplisher of the revelation of God, and as royal head and leader of His people to salvation, as pledge and mediator of that new covenant which was promised and typified in the Old, is *now* represented as a *Testator*, in that, for the vivid illustration of the close connection, lying in the very nature of the case, between the death of Jesus Christ and the attainment of the inheritance of the children of God, promised to us by God, and given over as His own, to Christ, for transmission to us, this comparison opens the

most appropriate and the most instructive analogies.

2. *Since such is the state of the case*, for this reason even in the formation of the old covenant, the application of blood, for cleansing and for expiation, was indispensable, and during the existence of that economy was always employed for such a purpose, in accordance with the *express command* of God. It was then, *with a reference* to the death of Jesus Christ, as the true and efficacious sacrifice, that this arrangement was instituted; and it is no accommodation to Jewish prejudices, and Rabbinical modes of expression, to regard Christ as a priest and an offering; rather, on the contrary, the Levitical offerings are to be conceived under the point of view *of a divinely ordained type* of the sacrifice determined in the eternal counsels of God, and freely undertaken by Christ, (ch. x. 5 ff.). Hence the ὅθεν, v. 18.

3. In this connection becomes explicable, also, the *sprinkling* of the Tabernacle, and of the sacred vessels, and of the sacred records of the divine revelation and covenant, *with blood*, as well as the sprinkling of the people, although this belongs only to tradition. It expresses the *obligation inhering in both parties* for the offering of the efficient sacrifice, and the *present* inability to furnish it with the means existing at the time. *Remittere peccata non est opus absolutæ misericordiæ, sed fit interveniente simul satisfactione eaque sufficientissima licet a misericordia divina procurata.* (Seb. Schmidt).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Obedience to the ordinances of God is not merely the duty of men, but our best auxiliary in the struggle against sin.—The law of God which makes acquainted with and condemns sin, points also the way to the forgiveness of sin.—Sin is a stain which can be removed only by blood.—On the connection of sin, expiation, and forgiveness.

STARKE:—Just as surely as Christ has died, so sure is the covenant of grace with God.—Divine justice demanded blood, and without this God could not be propitiated, Col. i. 14, 20.—Moses, a faithful servant in the house of God. Blessed are they who are his imitators!—There is, in itself, nothing pure before God, not even the holy place, nor the teachers who enter thither to conduct the service of God, as the people who assemble there to serve God, and this even in their best acts; yet the blood of Christ purifies all.—How capital a point of faith is furnished by the blood and death of Jesus Christ! without this, all His suffering were in vain, and that even though it had been far heavier than it was. By this we are reconciled with God.

RIEGER:—Only through Christ, and His death, has the whole blessing of redemption, which God would apply to us miserable wretches for our salvation, amounted to a proper testament and bequest, *i. e.*, to a gracious economy confirmed by the death of its Author.

HEUBNER:—If everything is defiled by the impure hands of men, if the whole earth is desecrated by sin, then does everything stand in need of cleansing and consecration, Job xv. 4.—In the *expiatory* power of the death of Jesus lies its proper significance, Is. liii.—Without a surrender to death there is no reconciliation. The yielding up of life an expiation for desecrated life, Ex. xvii. 11.

IV.

The necessary, yet never repeated sacrificial death of Christ has introduced a perfectly satisfactory propitiation.

CHAPTER IX. 23-28.

23 It *was* therefore necessary that the patterns [copies] of the things in the heavens
should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices
24 than these. For Christ is not entered [did not enter] into the holy places made with
hands, *which are* the figures [counterparts] of the true [genuine, ἀληθινῶν]; but into
heaven itself, now to appear [to be manifested, ἐμφανισθῆναι] in the presence of God
25 for us: Nor yet [and not, οὐδέ] that he should [may] offer himself often, as the high
26 priest entereth into the holy place every year with the blood of others: For then must
he often have suffered since the foundation of the world : but now [as it is, νυνί] once
in the end of the world [ages, αἰώνων] hath he appeared [been manifested, πεφανέρωται]
27 to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself [by means of his sacrifice]. And as [in so
much as καθ' ὅσον] it is appointed [reserved, ἀπόκειται] unto men once to die, but after
28 that the judgment: So [also][1] Christ was once [for all] offered to bear the sins of
many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin
unto salvation.

1 Ver. 27.—καί is to be read after οὕτως, according to the united testimony of the Uncials.

[Ver. 23.—τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα *the copies indeed;* or *while the copies.* ὑπόδειγμα something shown or exhibited *under* in subordination to, something else, whether as a *pattern*, or a *copy;* here clearly the latter; though perhaps it may be better to take ὑπό as *lessening*, lowering down, the signification, thus *faint sketch, delineation, outline.*

Ver. 24.—οὐ γὰρ εἰς χειροποίητα εἰσῆλ., *for not into a sanctuary made with hands did Christ enter*—for it was no sanctuary made with hands, into which, *etc.*—Τῶν ἀληθινῶν, *the genuine, the archetypal.*—ἐμφανισθῆναι *to be manifested*, not simply *to appear.*

Ver. 25.—οὐδ' ἵνα—προσφέρῃ *nor that he may* (not *might*) *offer himself.*

Ver. 26.—ἐπεὶ ἔδει—ἔδει ἄν, *since it were, would be, necessary for him frequently to suffer;* ἔδει logical as ch. ii. 1,—*he must frequently have suffered.** The meaning is not, with Del. and Alf., that His making repeated offerings now in the heavenly sanctuary, would necessitate His having previously frequently suffered on earth, inasmuch as each offering in the sanctuary presupposes a previous suffering on earth. This is a thought altogether too far-fetched for the scope of the passage. The writer argues, in my judgment, simply from the historical fact, or perhaps rather confirms his statement by a reference to the historical fact. If He were entered into the heavenly sanctuary, in order to make, as the high-priest did, repeated entrances into it, it would follow, as a logical conclusion, that there must have been a series of such acts in former ages. If, like the entrances of the Levitical high-priest, His entrance and presentation of Himself were of such a nature as to require *repetition*, then, of course, there should have been a series of sufferings and entrances in former times. But in contrast with that, and as showing the *single and decisive* character of His High-Priestly entrance, he has, in fact, (νυνὶ δέ) been manifested but once, and that, once for all, at the consummation of the ages.—διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ, *by His sacrifice*—the sacrifice which He made. It was, indeed, a sacrifice of *Himself*, but this is not expressed in the text.

Ver. 27.—καθ' ὅσον not simply *as* (ὡς, or καθώς) but *inasmuch as*, assigning a ground or reason.—ἀπόκειται, *it* (lies away) *is reserved for*, not *is appointed.*—εἰς σωτηρίαν *for salvation* is by some connected with the Part. ἀπεκδεχ. but by most better with ὀφθήσεται, *will appear for salvation.*—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 23. **It was necessary now,** *etc.*—The nature of the following verse renders it more desirable to supply ἦν (Ebr., Del.), than ἐστίν (Lün.). The ἐπουράνια are not the heavenly blessings (Seb. Schmidt, Ramb., and others); not the Christian Church (Chrys., Theod., Este, Lapid., Calov, Heubn. *etc.*); but the heavenly *sanctuary* in contrast with its earthly copy made with hands. The plur. κρείττοσι θυσίαις points not to the sufferings, prayers, and works of love of Christians, in common with the sacrificial death of Jesus (Grot., Paul.). It is the plural of *kind*, or *class.* But to transform *purification* into *consecration* (Bl., Lün., De W., *etc.*) is totally unallowable, as is also the substituting in the place of the heavenly sanctuary, the *men* who belong to the New Test. economy (Thom. Aqu., Beng., Menk., Thol., *etc.*). But neither is the cleansing in question an actual purging of heaven by the casting out of Satan, which Akersloot would refer to Luke x. 18, John xii. 31; while Bleek would explain in accordance with Rev. xii. 7–9. The context demands an *expiatory* purification, *i. e.*, a doing away of the influence of human sin upon the heavenly sanctuary (Stier, Hofm., Del., Riehm, Alf.).

VER. 24. **For not into a sanctuary made with hands,** *etc.*—The author is not assigning the ground why there is now *need* of better sacrifices for the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary (Hofm.), nor giving the proof that Christ *has actually entered* into the heavenly sanctuary, (Bl., Lün.,) nor illustrating the *contrast* between the earthly and the heavenly sanctuary (Ebr.), nor is he demonstrating the necessity of better offerings for the heavenly world from the *reality* of the one which has been furnished and offered to God (Del.). He is confirming the declaration of the previous verse, that the purification argued as *necessary*, has been *actually* accomplished. Hofm. now concedes, that the Infin. Aor. ἐμφανισθῆναι constitutes no ground of objection (WIN. § 44; Matt. xx. 26; 1 Pet. iv. 2) to our understanding the νῦν of the *permanent presence* of Christ before the unveiled face of God in heaven. The position of the ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν at the end of the clause, throws intentional and weighty emphasis upon the soteriological significance of this ἐμφανισθῆναι, a significance referable in its purpose to the persons of the readers. This word expresses (Acts xxiv. 1) strikingly the *reciprocal* and unveiled face to face manifestation of God and Christ, and is found in no corresponding sense among the technical expressions of the old covenant.

VER. 25.—**May offer himself,** *etc.*—The προσφέρειν ἑαυτόν refers not to Christ's offering Himself on earth. In that case it were virtually =παθεῖν, v. 26, which, as ch. xiii. 12, is to be understood of the suffering of death. But the offering of the blood in the heavenly all-holy presupposes the slaying of the victim outside of the Adyton, and is brought about by the entrance of the high-priest, of whom after his entrance, was required a two-fold offering of different kinds of blood (ch. ix. 7), as his entrance was preceded by the slaughter of two different victims. To this refer the expressions of our passage, in which to avoid a misapprehension of the plur. θυσίαις, used in v. 23, the idea is *repelled* that in the heavenly all-holy, whither Christ has entered, not in alien but in His own blood, He has now to offer Himself *at repeated times.* Had repeated offerings of Himself been the purpose of His entrance into heaven, which assuredly is in every case to be conceived of as but a single one (Schlicht. and Böhme, Bl., Hofm., Del.), then must also a πολλάκις παθεῖν have preceded, and that indeed "from the foundation of the world," *i. e.*, Christ would have been obliged to suffer just as many times before His entrance to God, as He now was repeatedly to offer Himself before God (Hofm., Del., Alf.). But this would contradict the fact that Christ has become man, not at the beginning, but at the end of the world. This explanation is far more probable than the common one that Christ would otherwise have been obliged every time to return into the world.

[I do not see much to choose between the two explanations: *viz.*, that which urges the singleness of Christ's entrance and offering in the heavenly sanctuary, on the ground that

[* Alford criticises the Eng. ver. "must have suffered" on the ground that the antecedent time, being already indicated by the ἔδει, need not be again expressed by παθεῖν. The criticism would be just if the ἔδει were in the English version instead of in the Greek. But in English the *must*, which translates the ἔδει, not having in itself the idea of past time, this idea has to be put into the accompanying Infinitive. The rendering of the common version is therefore, I think, idiomatic and unexceptionable.—K.].

otherwise He would have had repeatedly to *descend* and suffer, inasmuch as every προσφέρειν implied a previous παθεῖν, and that which urges the singleness of His προσφέρειν, on the ground that otherwise He must have gone through a series of sacrificial sufferings while remaining on earth, in order to accumulate, as it were, a stock of sacrificial suffering, on the strength of which He might make an equal number of priestly offerings in the heavenly sanctuary. Or rather it seems to me that the latter view, though supported by Del., Alf., and Moll, is much the harsher and more improbable of the two. For although it is undoubtedly true, as Del. urges, that the author takes his stand on the assumption of only a single presentation of Christ in heaven, yet it is equally true that this is based on the actually existing state of facts, *viz.*, on the singleness of Christ's sacrificial suffering on earth. For it surely is not more monstrous to assume a series of descents to earth and reëntrances into heaven after suffering death, than to assume a series of deaths continuously occurring on earth to be followed subsequently by as many successive high-priestly entrances into the heavenly sanctuary. The latter seems to me, considering the analogy of the Jewish rites, much the more unnatural of the two. In point of fact I do not believe that the writer had in mind precisely either of the above ideas, though that which he had comes much nearer to the first than the second. The question is not in his mind a question of the *relation* between a supposed series of priestly offerings in heaven, and a corresponding series of sufferings on earth. It is simply a logical deduction from a matter of fact. If Christ's entrance into heaven were of the nature of the Jewish priest's entrances into the Mosaic sanctuary, such, *viz.*, as to involve a repetition of His entrances, and offerings from time to time, this must have led inevitably to, *and manifested itself in*, His repeated sufferings in the successive ages of the world. But there has been no such manifestation. He has, *in fact*, (νυνί) appeared and suffered but *once*, and that at the very close of the old period, and when the former age is about to merge into the new. This fact is in itself decisive of the nature of His priesthood. It at once *grows out of*, and *demonstrates* the fact, that His priesthood, unlike that of the Levitical priests, is one in which *one* act of suffering on earth, and *one* priestly entrance into and offering in heaven, accomplish the whole work.—K.].

The πεφανέρωται refers not to the appearance in heaven before God, (Grot., Schultz, *etc.*), but to the φανέρωσις ἐν σαρκί, 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Pet. i. 20; v. 4; 1 John ii. 28; iii. 5, 8. The expression ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων is in sense=ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ch. i. 1; and like the Pauline (1 Cor. x. 11) τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων, is a translation of the Heb. קֵץ הָעוֹלָם. The connection of the words διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ with πεφανέρωται (Grot., Carpz., Böhme, Thol. *etc.*), is unnatural, "since θυσία appears much rather as expressing the *end* of the manifestation of Christ than the *means* of that manifestation." (Del.). These words are thus to be closely connected with εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας, which gives the object of Christ's appearance on the world's theatre of action, *viz.*, "the doing away, absolutely, and beyond the need of being supplemented with any second similar manifestation, of all that is sinful."

VER. 27. **And inasmuch as it is reserved,** *etc.*—Καθ' ὅσον constitutes not, like καθώς, merely a comparison, but at the same time a *reason*, in this case for the fact that in Christ also, along with His death, the work of His first appearance on earth has been once for all completed, and admits no repetition; but that something corresponding to the *judgment* is still also in reference to Him to be looked for. This reason lies in His real assumption of human nature. The author for this reason also employs the Pass. προσενεχθείς, "*being* offered," because in this comparison the sacrifice of Christ is regarded not as a voluntary offering, but as a suffering *appointed* to Him, as something *befalling* Him (Hofm.). We must therefore not, with Chrys., supply ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ, *by Himself*. Ἀνενεγκεῖν is understood by the Pesh., Chrys., Œc., Theoph., Michael., of the *presenting and offering up* of sins in sacrifice; by Luth., Schlicht., Grot., Bl., Hofm. (*Schriftb.* 1 Ed.), Lün., *etc.*, of the *taking them away*=ἀφαιρεῖν, chap. x. 4; by HOFM. in 2 Ed. of *Schriftb.*, in its classic sense of *bearing up under, sustaining, enduring them;* by Jac. Cappell., Calov, Beng., *etc.*, of *bearing them to the cross*, according to 1 Pet. ii. 24; by August., Este, Seb. Schmidt, Böhme, De W., Bisp., Del., Riehm, Alf., of *vicarious bearing*, according to Is. liii. 12, where it is said of the Servant of Jehovah: αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκε. This latter view, now also ably defended by EBR. (*Allg. Kirchenzeit.*, 1856, Nr. 116-127) has specially in its favor the declaration that Christ, at His second coming will appear χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας. Chrys., Theod., Grot. and others refer erroneously this latter expression to the *redeemed*, who will then be entirely perfected. It refers to *the person of Christ*. Even in His first appearance His person was sinless, and sin was not in Jesus in the form of *concupiscentia*, as maintained by Dippel, Menken, Irving. But it partly assailed Him in the form of *temptation*, chap. iv. 15, partly lay upon Him in the form of *punishment*, 2 Cor. v. 21. The expression χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας stands in antithesis to the εἰς τὸ πολλὰ ἀνενεγ. ἁμαρτ. Thus in the main rightly Œc., Theophyl., Carpz., De W., Bisp., Hofm., Del. and others. We need not, however, for this reason take ἁμαρτία as *sin-offering* (J. Capp., Storr, *etc.*), or as *punishment* for sin (Klee, Thol., *etc.*), or (with Schultz) *having to do* with sin. Unauthorized alike by the language and by the fact, is the view of Theodor. Mops., Theodoret, Bl., that the phrase in question implies that there will then be no realm of evil and of sin which could require the work and agency of the reappearing Christ. A *visible* return is indicated by the ὀφθήσεται, and it is characterized as the *second* appearance, because the appearances to the disciples, which took place after the resurrection and before the ascension, belong to the period of Christ's first coming to earth. The reading διὰ πίστεως either after or before εἰς σωτηρίαν (adopted by Lachm. after A. 81, 47, but in 1850 again expunged), is a gloss. Still less are we authorized to connect εἰς σωτηρίαν with

ἀπεκδεχομένοις (Primas., Camerar., Klee, Stein, *etc.*). It belongs to ὀφθήσεται, and points to final deliverance from all misery.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. In the death of Christ that has been really fulfilled which the sprinkling of the sacred book and of the sacred vessels of the temple with blood, symbolically represented. The sanctuary originated *in reference* to human guilt and sin, but has been purified from the *guilt* of the general corruption, by the fact that the Son of God, who, by the establishment of the covenant with sinful men, has, although from pure grace, yet assumed the *obligation* of their ransom, has actually and all-sufficiently offered Himself as a *vicarious* offering.

2. By Jesus Christ's single and unrepeated, yet all-sufficient offering of Himself, the *guilty* relations of *collective* humanity are *objectively* removed, at whatever time its members may live upon the earth; so that neither does a *repeated presentation of Himself* take place in heaven (which would presuppose a corresponding repetition of the sufferings of Christ, since the beginning of the world), nor is the *second coming* of the Messiah, which is in the certain future, for the purpose of a second vicarious suffering. By virtue of the true *deity* of the Saviour, His single offering is *for ever sufficient;* by virtue of His true humanity He is incapable of *rendering it more than once.*

3. The "now" of the manifestation of Christ on our behalf before the face of God in heaven, so that no veiling cloud intervenes, such as was in the Mosaic sanctuary, Lev. xvi. 2, is the *present period of salvation*, which, as the closing period, lasts until the *parousia*, and has, as its condition and historical commencement, the appearance of Christ in the flesh with His single and final offering.

4. Christ has not merely entered, from love and compassion, into the *fellowship of human suffering*, but He has taken upon Himself the *burden of human sin;* and this burden, under which men were in danger of utterly succumbing, He has been able to lift from them in no other way than by voluntarily enduring *for them the punishment of sins which* they had deserved, and by His vicarious death taking it from *all* the guilty—who here, as chap. ii. 10, are called *many*, not in the particularistic sense of an exclusion of some from salvation merely by virtue of the electing purpose of God, nor in reference to the failure of some to fulfil the *condition* of a participation in salvation, but, as Matth. xx. 28; xxvi. 28; Luke xxii. 20; Mark xiv. 34, with reference to the fact that the single offering of the one God-man, is forever efficacious for humanity in all its manifold members. To the application of the doctrine of vicarious suffering to the passage before us, it cannot, with Hofm., be objected, that an expiatory bearing of sin cannot be designated as the *aim and object* of His offering of Himself. With entire correctness Del. replies to the objection: "Atonement for sin was not indeed the purpose of men in bringing upon Him this infliction; but might be none the less the purpose of God in subjecting Him to it, and his own in submitting to it."

5. The earlier opinion, still held by Heubner, that for individuals judgment follows immediately upon their death, but that after the resurrection follows the manifestation of the judgment in relation to all, cannot at least be deduced from our passage. *The contemporaneousness of the judgment and of the second coming of Christ*, follow clearly from chap. x. 25, 37 ff.; and the decision according to which the lot of the one class is perdition (ἀπώλεια) and that of the other περιποίησις ψυχῆς, is mentioned ch. x. 38 ff., as a consequence of the coming of Christ. Nevertheless, when the *Judge* in our Epistle is expressly designated (chap. x. 30 ff.; xii. 23, 25, 29; xiii. 4) not Christ, but God is named, which might stand connected with the fact (D. Schultz) that God is the being that makes the enemies of Christ His footstool. Since, however, the glory and majesty of Christ, are elsewhere strongly emphasized in our Epistle, it might at first seem surprising that the judgment is no where expressly ascribed to Christ. From this, however, we may not with Bleek, deduce the inference that that Divine judgment which destroys the adversaries, *precedes* the *parousia.* This may, with Riehm, be more simply and satisfactorily explained, from the fact that the exalted Christ stood before the author's mind as a heavenly High-priest, and it was therefore entirely natural to regard as the object of His reappearance upon earth, merely the consummation of His high-priestly work, *i. e.*, the complete salvation of believers, and on the other hand, to ascribe to God Himself the accompanying judgment, and the punishment of the adversaries.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The appearance of Jesus Christ on earth *terminates* one, and *opens* another section of the history of the world.—How does the *entrance* of Christ into heaven stand related to the *object* of His appearance on earth?—The *likeness* and the *unlikeness* of the death of Jesus Christ, and of the dying of the children of men, 1, in their *causes*, 2, in their *results.*—The divine ordering in the connection of sin, death, and judgment.—How does the second appearance of Jesus Christ in the world distinguish itself from the first? 1, in respect to His *person;* 2, in His relation to *sin;* 3, in His influence on the *world.*—In Christ we experience that there is a contact with sin, which does not *defile*, but which *annihilates* sin.—The *doing away* of the *hinderances* to our *blessedness.*—The looking forward of believers to the appearance of the Lord, 1, in its authorization; 2, in its satisfaction; 3, in its obligation.

STARKE:—There are, indeed, many offerings made to the Lord, but the most from hypocrisy, and although such have great outward show, yet they do not please Him. The sacrifices which please God, are a broken heart and a contrite spirit, Ps. li. 19.—The appearance of Christ in the presence of God is not merely the presentation and holding forth of His person and of His propitiatory sacrifice; but extends also to a true, glorious, and powerful intercession, in the strictest sense of the word. But He prays no longer thus humbly as when He was upon earth; for

His prayer belongs to His state of exaltation, and is a fruit of His sitting at the right hand of God, the Father.—Men are at no time so holy as to be absolutely beyond sinning; but since we daily sin much, and deserve punishment, we always need purification through the blood of Jesus.—The single offering of Christ upon the cross, takes away sin.—Only once has He been sacrificed, and more than once He may not be sacrificed, and therefore not in the sacred Supper.—The last judgment is as certain as death. —Observe, that upon death follows the judgment. Look to it, then, and strive with the highest industry, that thou die happy, and that thou mayest await with joy the appearance of thy Saviour for thy salvation.—To await Christ's coming unto salvation is the prerogative of believers, who have received for this, in a living hope, the first fruits of the Spirit; who love the appearing of the Lord, and, in order that they may hold themselves in readiness for a blissful death, deny the world and say: Even so, Come Lord Jesus, Rev. xxii. 20.—The ungodly will not be looking for the coming of Christ at the final judgment, although He will appear unto them, whether they will or no; and this undesired appearing will to them be full of sadness (Jude 15, Rev. i. 7).—Only when Christ shall appear will believers become perfectly blessed, Col. iii. 4.

RIEGER:—The heavenly sanctuary which Christ has entered in His appearing before God, is also the goal to which He will bring all who come to God by Him.—Whosoever learns from the Gospel the cause and fruit of the appearance of Jesus in the flesh, and of His offering for sin, and learns it with a loving knowledge, he may look with joy for His appearance in glory, and for the consummation of His own blessedness.—What a difference between the two appearances of Jesus, in weakness and in glory! then, under the burden of our sins, with the accompaniments of shame, the cross, and death; now, in His endless life, in the power of God and His revelation in glory.

HEUBNER:—Only in eternity shall we see from what an abyss Christ has rescued us, and into what glory He translates us.—Redemption was, in the mind of God, virtually effected from eternity, 2 Tim. i. 9. There was, then, need of no appearance in the presence of God; but that appearance of the crucified One which has taken place in *time*, was made to reveal the counsel of God to the world of spirits.—The duration of the world is limited to a fixed period of time. As surely as it has a beginning, so surely will it have an end.—Waiting is the Christian's art. He waits for the appearance of Christ, whereby the truth of faith is victoriously confirmed, and Christ is manifested to be the Being whom Christians regard Him.

STEINHOFER:—Jesus, the founder of the new covenant, has gathered up the sin of the whole world, together with all its evil fruits, upon the cross, and has, once for all, so completely driven them away, that, under the testimony of the Gospel, we need make no further distinction in respect of *many*, or of *great* sins.

MENKEN:—If even the earthly figures of heavenly things were desecrated and defiled by the communion which sinful men had with them, and could, therefore, remain in connection with them only on account of offered sacrifices, and only by means of certain holy expiations and purifyings, how much less could we anticipate an immediate, unconditional, unobstructed communion of dying and sinful men with heavenly things!

HAHN:—The heavenly things flee before us in our impurity, and thither may no impure person come; and yet all the treasures of the suffering and death of Christ are deposited there, and thence must we obtain them. If we wish anything therefrom, we must again be reconciled with the sanctuary. But this is accomplished only through the blood of Christ.—Happy is he who has laid the foundation of his faith in the first appearing of Christ; he will behold Him with joy in the second.

V.

The perpetually repeated expiations of the old covenant attest their impotence for any real taking away of sin.

CHAPTER X. 1-4.

For the law having a shadow of [the] good things to come, *and* [*om.* and] not the
very image of the things, can [1] never with those [the same] sacrifices, which[2] they
offered [offer, προσφέρουσιν] year by year continually, make the comers thereunto per-
2 fect. For then would they not[3] have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers
once purged[4] [having once for all been cleansed] should [would] have had no more
3 conscience [*or* consciousness] of sins. But in those *sacrifices* [in them] *there is* a re-
4 membrance again *made* [*om. made*] of sins every year. For *it is* not possible that the
blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin.

[1] Ver. 1.—The meaningless Plur. *δύνανται* in Sin. A. C. D**. and many minusc. is to be regarded as a clerical error. In order to explain it Lachm. put a point after *πραγμάτων*, and omitted in his small ed. the relative before *προσφέρ.* with A., 2, 7*, 17, 47, while A*. 31, Philox. introduce *αἱ* before *οὐδέποτε*. The Sing. is found in D*. D***. E. K. L. and many minusc., also Vulg. Itala. Copt.

[2] Ver. 1.—Instead of *ἃς* Bl., Tisch., Alf., read (after Sin. D*. L. (?) N. Lat. ver. before D. and E., also minusc. 73, 178) *αἷς*, which, however, might have easily sprung from the endings of the three immediately preceding words.

[3] Ver. 2.—For *ἐπεὶ ἂν* all authorities require the reading *ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄν*.

[4] Ver. 2.—The reading *κεκαθαρισμένους* deserves the preference, as is also indicated by the reading *κεκαθερισμένους* in A. and C., (whether this orthography be a mere blunder in copying, or more probably, a conformity of the spelling to a careless pronunciation.)

[Ver. 1—*Σκιὰν γὰρ ἔχων*, *for a shadow the law having, etc.* The emphasis of the Greek order of words can hardly be reached in English.—*κατ' ἐνιαυτόν*, *annually, year by year*, is difficult as to position. Ebr., Hofm., Del., Alf. connect with *οὐδέποτε δύναται*; Calv., Bl. De W., *etc.*, with *προσφέρουσιν*. The former seems the easier, and, though harsh in construction, very forcible, "year by year with the same sacrifices, *etc.*, can never." But see below.—*ἃς προσφέρουσιν*, *which they offer*, not as Eng. ver. *offered*, the figure of the present time having been kept up from the preceding chapter, and especially as the old covenant sacrifices did undoubtedly still continue. Still, that the writer's mind is mainly on the past, is shown by the Aor. *ἐπαύσαντο*, for which, if he had distinct reference to the present time, the Imperf. *ἐπαύοντο* should be used.

Ver. 2.—*ἐπεί*, *since, viz:* in that case, Rom. iii. 6; 1 Cor. xv. 29 —*συνείδησιν*, *consciousness*=moral consciousness, conscience.—*ἅπαξ κεκαθ.*, *having been once for all cleansed.*

Ver. 3.—*ἐν αὐταῖς*, *in them;* the addition of the Eng. ver. is unnecessary.—*ἀνάμνησις*, *a calling to mind, remembrance.* —*κατ' ἐνιαυτόν*, *year by year.*

Ver. 4.—*ἀδύνατον γάρ*, *for it is impossible*, ch. vi. 4.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 1.—**Image.**—*Εἰκών* is not the essence itself (Peshito, Luth., Grot., Justiniani, *etc.*); nor the primitive form of the original (Stengel) which is then explained as the substantial essence of the things; nor merely the finished picture in contrast with the slight and shadowy outline (Chrys., Theodoret, *etc.*); but the *living historical form*, in which the *invisible essence* finds its representation.

Can never, *etc.*—The *προσφέροντες* are the priests, the *προσερχόμενοι* are the members of the congregation to whom the offering belongs. *Κατ' ἐνιαυτόν* is connected by Ebr., Hofm., Del., Alf., with *οὐδέποτε δύναται*, by Calv., Bl., De W., *etc.*, with *ἃς προσφέρ.* by most intpp. with *ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις*=the same year by year, or annual offerings. Hofm. also connects, with Paulus and Lachm., *εἰς τὸ διηνεκές* with *τελειῶσαι*, and further makes the *προσερχόμενοι* the subject of *προσφέρ.* We should thus have the statement that the individual members of the congregation, by the fact of their continuing throughout the year to bring offerings for themselves, and these of the same kind as those brought by the high-priests, *viz.:* animal offerings, furnished a practical proof of the insufficiency of the law, and of the expiatory offerings ordained by the law, and annually offered by the high-priest in behalf of the whole congregation, to produce any real and permanent perfection. In favor of this we may indeed be pointed to the like connection, *τελειοῦν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές* v. 14, and to the sharp contrast of this idea "perfecting *in perpetuum*" with the *οὐδέποτε*; but, on the other hand, we may urge with Bleek, and others the tameness of the relative clause, *ἃς προσφέρουσιν* when standing without *εἰς τὸ διην.*, and the forcible suggestion of Tholuck, that the very combination *κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ταυς αὐταῖς θυσίαις εἰς τὸ διηνηκές*, in connection with the *οὐδέποτε*, presents, as in a vivid picture, an endlessly recurring round of painful and unavailing ceremonies (as at v. 11). The individual expressions will not aid in solving the problem. *Εἰς τὸ διηνεκές* (an Ionic form for the Attic *διανεκές*, which found its way into familiar use) harmonizes well with the idea that the offering of sacrifices, under the dominion and in accordance with the purposes of the law, continues on indefinitely and endlessly into the future—a point unsuccessfully combated by Hofmann. Nor again does the word *λατρεύειν*, v. 2, necessitate our adoption of Hofmann's view; for though we grant, indeed, that the term here denotes no priestly function, (as Este., *etc.*), but refers to the service of the private members of the congregation; yet this service again does not here as at ch. ix. 9, refer to the offering of gifts and sacrifices, but to the general religious worship of the congregation who, *by means of priestly offerings*, were drawing near to God. On the other hand, we must concede (comp. ch. xi. 4, 17, with Sept., at Num. xxxi. 50) that the statement of Del., that *προσφέρειν*, in our Epistle, denotes exclusively an official and priestly offering, must be accepted with limitation. The decision then of the question turns upon this. The author is assigning the ground for the declaration, made but a little before, of Christ's having entered, *once for all*, with His high-priestly offering of Himself into the heavenly holy of holies. He finds this ground in the utter inefficacy of the *annually recurring* expiatory sacrifices of the Levitical high-priest, which were ordained by the law, and which were of *ever unvarying quality*, and which had, therefore, but one significance in their bearing on the establishment of the New Covenant, which was at once promised and typified in the old. The law, in consequence of its peculiar nature—a nature inseparable from its purpose and destination—has not the power, by its annually recurring and prescribed expiatory offerings, to secure for the congregation perfection, *i. e.*, that substantial and abiding purification which brings them into relationship with God. Could such have been the effect of these offerings on the congregation, the annual sin-offerings, and with these the Old Covenant itself would have ceased, and been done away; there would have been such a removal and doing away of the sense of guilt, as could take place only on the basis of completely satisfactory, and hence *final* and *unrepeated* sacrifice. This view of Hofm. thus becomes, in every way, improbable. It is discountenanced alike by the fact that even in the New Covenant the individual members of the church may not cease to seek, on the basis of the expiation once for all accomplished by Christ, individual reconciliation and continued forgiveness of their sins, and also that even in the Old Covenant the continued service and offerings of individuals were no less studiously and explicitly

enjoined than the annual sin-offering of the high-priest.

VER. 2.—**For otherwise would they not have ceased,** *etc.*—If we omit the οὐκ, the sentence must be taken as an *affirmation;* the better reading with οὐκ makes it interrogative. The construction of παύεσθαι, with the Particip., is entirely classical. Hofm. refers ἀλλά to the main negative statement of v. 1, and translates, by "*sondern*," making it simply the counterpart of that negative statement (*viz: cannot make perfect, but, instead of that, there is a remembrance*). But it is more natural to refer it to v. 2 as=on the contrary. Ἀνάμνησις might mean (with Vulg., Calov, and others) *commemoration*, or (as Schlicht. Grot., Beng., *etc.*) *commemoratio publica*, in allusion to the three penitential acknowledgments of the high-priest on the day of atonement. But the common signification *in memoriam revocatio* is to be preferred as the more comprehensive. Del. has given in full the three penitential prayers in his history of Heb. poesy, p. 186 ff. Συνείδησις ἁμαρτ. is not the consciousness of sin in general, but that which brings back upon the man the personal criminality, responsibility, and punishableness involved in his sins. Com. GÜDER (*Stud. und Krit.*, 1857 II. 279 ff. *Inquiry into the Scriptural Doctrine of Conscience*).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The heavenly good things are even to Christians still in the *future;* but because, and from the time when, Christ appeared as high-priest of those good things (ch. ix. 11), we are *brought* into *actual fellowship* with them, and we have, as already tasting (vi. 5) the powers of the world to come, the pledge and the assurance that we shall yet, as children of God entitled to their inheritance, enter into their full possession. The Gospel renders possible not merely a clear and sharp expression of them, but also the formation of heavenly relations upon earth; the introduction and setting forth, the use and enjoyment of the heavenly good things even in the world, of which the law was able to furnish only an unsubstantial and shadowy image. "Christ stands, as it were, in the meridian light of the great day of time, and casts His shadow backwards over the whole Old Covenant. But as the shadow is seen only in the light, and comes out all the more clearly and sharply in proportion to the brightness of the light, so it is only in the light of the New Covenant that we recognize clearly the typical character of the old." (Bisping).

2. With the certainty of an atonement actually accomplished, and truly acknowledged of God, comes a completed *transformation* of the moral and religious conscience and consciousness of man. No longer is this consciousness filled with sin and with the fear of righteous punishment, under the sense of unremoved guilt; but it enjoys reconciliation in consequence of the forgiveness of sin wrought through grace, and by virtue of an atonement. The subjects of this reconciliation, inasmuch as they are not yet brought to a state of perfection, need, it is true, the continuous appropriation of the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ, and of its influences; but inasmuch as they have been, once for all, brought into the new relation of salvation and peace with God, they have no need of the successive repetitions of that sacrifice. In fact, the *repetition* of the sin-offering shows, that it does not accomplish that which it signifies; that it is thus not the true sin-offering, as the animal sacrifices in pagan religions show indeed the need of an atonement, but are inadequate to the satisfaction of that need.

3. The idea of the *sacrifice in the mass*, as a bloodless repetition of the bloody sacrifice on the cross, is entirely irreconcilable with this passage of Scripture, which lays its emphasis upon the fact that the repetition of the atoning sacrifice points back to its *objective insufficiency*, which would thus only strengthen and deepen our longing after that perfect and effectual expiatory system which the old economy only prefigured and paved the way for.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The actual deliverance of the conscience from the stain and burden of sin, is accomplished neither through human services, nor through legal sacrifices, but only through the *blood of Jesus Christ.*—The connection between the *service of God, approach to God,* and human *perfection.*—The pain and the blessing of a *remembrance of sin.*—The *means* for the *purification* of the conscience in our *religious services.*

STARKE:—All religious service must tend to this end, *viz.*, the perfection of man.—The forgiveness of sin takes away all guilt and punishment, but not the root and entire stain of sin.—Conscience accuses and bears testimony that we are ever, repeatedly, sinning and needing forgiveness.—Alike the days of feasting, of fasting and of prayer, ordained by Christianity, serve for a memorial of the Divine benefits and of our sins.

RIEGER:—Even the shadowy outline given by the law, is to be regarded as a great benefaction on the part of God.—The purification of the conscience is an inestimable good.

MENKEN:—So long as man does not possess the offering itself, but only a shadow of it, so long he must fail of true reconciliation. A shadow can never give that which lies only in the substance.

HEUBNER:—How great was the veneration of the Jews for the shadow! Do Christians hold in equal veneration the truth and reality?—What the blood of animals could not, the blood of Christ could effect.

VI.

Scriptural proof of the complete efficacy of the sanctification obtained on the basis of the obedience of Jesus Christ.

Chapter X. 5–18.

5 Wherefore, when he cometh [while coming, εἰσερχόμενος] into the world, he saith,
Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared [didst thou
6 form for, κατηρτίσω] me: In burnt offerings and *sacrifices* for sin thou hast had no
7 [hadst not] pleasure.[1] Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is writ-
8 ten of me) to do thy will, O God. Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering [sacri-
fices and offerings][2] and burnt offerings and *offering* for sin thou wouldest not, neither
9 hadst pleasure *therein;* which are offered by [according to] the[3] law; Then said he [he
said], Lo, I come to do thy will, O God [*om.* O God].[4] He taketh away the first, that he
10 may establish the second. By the which [In which] will we are [have been] sancti-
11 fied through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once *for all.* And every priest[5]
[indeed, μέν] standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices,
12 which can never take away sins: But this man [one][6] after he had offered one sacri-
13 fice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God; From henceforth expecting
14 [awaiting] till his enemies be made his footstool. For by one offering he hath per-
15 fected for ever them that are sanctified. *Whereof* [And, δέ] the Holy Ghost also is
16 a witness to us: for after that he had said before, This *is* the covenant that I will
make with them after those days; saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts,
17 and in [upon] their minds [understanding][7] will I write [inscribe, ἐπιγράψω] them; And
18 their sins and their iniquities will I remember[8] no more. Now [But] where remission
of these *is, there is* no more [an] offering for sin.

[1] Ver. 6.—ηὐδόκησας the form adopted (after A. C. D*.,) by Lachm. and Tisch., is to be preferred to εὐδόκησας.

[2] Ver. 8.—The plur. θυσίας καὶ προσφοράς, is, according to Sin. A. C. D*., 17, 23, 57, to be read instead of the sing., which repeats the words, ver. 5, and in Sin. is substituted by the corrector.

[3] Ver. 8.—The Art. before νόμον is wanting in Sin. A. C., 37, 46, 71, 73.

[4] Ver. 8.—The reading ὁ θεός after τοῦ ποιῆσαι is interpolated from ver. 7, and, with Sin. A. C. D. E. K., 17, 39, 46, is to be expunged.

[5] Ver. 11.—The authorities vary between ἱερεὺς and ἀρχιερεύς. The sense demands the former word, which is also found in Sin.

[6] Ver. 12.—The authority of Sin. A. C. D*. E., 67**, 80, 116, requires οὗτος δέ instead of αὐτὸς δέ.

[7] Ver. 16.—Instead of ἐπὶ τῶν διανοιῶν, as read by D***. E. J. K., and most minusc., ἐπὶ τὴν διάν., is to be preferred with Sin. A. C. D*., 17, 31, 47.

[8] Ver. 17.—Instead of μνησθῶ, read with Sin. A. C. D*. E., 17, μνησθήσομαι. Sin. has the former reading as a correction.

[Ver. 5.—εἰσερχόμενος, *while coming into, i. e.*, historically, not specially at his birth; but not εἰσελθών, *on entering*, or, *after entering*.—κατηρτίσω, didst thou *frame, fit out, perfect.*

Ver. 6.—περὶ ἁμαρτίας, *offerings for sin.*

Ver. 7.—τοῦ ποιῆσαι, denoting *purpose, i. e., in order to do.*

Ver. 8.—ἀνώτερον λέγων, *above, further back, while saying.*—αἵτινες, characteristic; *such as are.*—προσφέρονται, *are offered*, not, "*were offered.*"

Ver. 9.—εἴρηκεν, *he hath said* (chap. i. 13; iv. 3).

Ver. 10.—ἐν ᾧ θελήματι, *in which will*, not *by which will.* ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμέν, *we have been sanctified;* a completed act. *We are sanctified* might be that which habitually takes place, which would require ἁγιαζόμεθα.

Ver. 11.—πᾶς μὲν ἱερεύς, *every priest indeed*—while every priest.

Ver. 12.—οὗτος δέ, *but this one, but he.* Tisch. reads αὐτὸς δέ, *but he himself*, but against preponderating authority, including that of Sin.—προσενέγκας, *after offering.*

Ver. 13.—τὸ λοιπόν, *as to the rest, in future*—τοῦ λοιποῦ scil. χρόνον, *for the remaining time.*—ἕως, with subj. τεθῶσιν., for the more classical ἕως ἂν τεθῶσιν—τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους, *those who are being sanctified, or who are sanctified from time to time*, τοὺς ἡγιασμένους, would be *those who have been sanctified.*

Ver. 15.—μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν καί, *and testifies for us also.*

Ver. 16.—ἐπιγράψω, *I will inscribe.*

Ver. 17.—καὶ–μνησθήσομαι, Alf., dissenting from nearly all the recent comm., makes the apodosis of the citation commence here instead of with λέγει κύριος, ver. 16; but although there are objections to the latter, the difficulties of his construction, I think, are still greater; and the examples of the use of καί which he cites as justifying this construction (i. 5; ii. 13; iv. 5) present really no analogy to it.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 5. **Therefore while entering into the world,** *etc.*—The διό refers to the impossibility spoken of in ver. 4. The author is not adducing a *proof* of a doctrine perfectly evident and unquestioned; nor is he here—not until a little after—showing that even in the Old Covenant itself is expressed the consciousness of this state of things. He adduces, it is true, the words of Ps. xl. 7–9, in which David, after his anointing, but before ascending the throne, recognizes a relative fulfilment of the prophecy, that "the Prince is to spring forth from Judah," and declares that he, in contrast with Saul, is ready, under the guidance of Samuel (1 Sam. xv. 22), to accomplish the will of Jehovah, which lays stress, not on ritual sacrifices, but upon the offering of *obedience*, and the sacrifice of the will. But the *form* of the application is not that of *citation;* for the subject of λέγει is not David but Christ. And besides, since the present ἐρχόμενος is not=*venturus* (Erasm.), but is coincident in time with λέγει, the author clearly treats the words of the Psalm, not as a direct prophecy of Christ regarding himself. He rather puts into the mouth of Christ, on the basis of the typical relation of the Old and New Covenant, the words of David as his own, since they are fulfilled by him; and his special purpose is to render prominent the *self-moved and voluntary* act of the antitypal David in his entrance into the world for the sake of offering himself as an all-sufficient expiatory offering. As the part. is not εἰσελθών, we can refer it neither to the later entrance of Jesus on His public ministry (Bl., De W.), nor to the age of conscious choice and volition in man, indicated Is. vii. 16 (Del.).

But a body didst thou form for me.—The Heb. text has: "Ears didst thou bore for me." This is referred by Hengst., von Gerl., and others, with the ancient intpp. (who also translate erroneously "bore through, perforate") to the custom mentioned Ex. xxi. 6; Deut. xv. 17, of boring through the ear-lap of a servant who might become free, but preferred to remain in the voluntary and permanent service of his master. But we should rather refer the expression to our capacity of understanding by means of the ear, the expressed will of God, and thus of learning the way and means of acceptable sacrifice. Any arbitrary change of the text may not be charged upon our author. He found the reading σῶμα in the MSS. of the Sept., of which but few and inconsiderable ones have ὠτία or ὦτα. Bl., Lün., and others, assume that σῶμα is an old corruption in the text, sprung from ἠθέλησα ΣΩΤΙΑ. But neither is כָּרִיתָ literally rendered by ὤρυξας. We must, therefore, suppose a *generalizing* of the thought as early as the Greek translation, and the more so as the further rendering ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ, favored the supposition that the one who is speaking here is He of whom Moses and the prophets testified, and for whose divinely decreed coming the Old Testament had prepared the way (Del.). Κεφαλίς=*little head* is originally the name of the knobs at the end of the staves about which the scroll or volume was wound, and then the volume itself, with or without the addition of βιβλίον, Ezek. ii. 9; iii. 1–3; Ezra vi. 2. Luther renders the word by *chiefly, pre-eminently*, inasmuch as some took it as=*chief part* or portion. Others translate "in the beginning," as if having reference to a definite passage. In the Hebr. text the language is: "I come with the volume of the book which is written of me," referring to the Prince's code, Deut. xvii. 14 ff., which the sovereign was always to keep at hand for his guidance. In the Heb. and in the Sept., the words "to do Thy will, O God," are followed by, *it was my pleasure*, ἠβουλήθην. In dropping this word, our author throws the clause ἐν κεφαλίδι—ἐμοῦ into parenthesis, and makes τοῦ ποιῆσαι dependent on ἥκω, which Thol. takes in its classical use as Perf., *I am come, I am present.* Εὐδοκεῖν takes in the classics the Dat., but in Hellenistic Gr. ἐν (ch. x. 38) or frequently, as here, ver. 6, the Acc. Also Lev. vii. 37; Num. viii. 8, the Sept. designates the sin offering by the bare περὶ ἁμαρτίας, the idea of *sacrifice* being supplied from the connection (Œc., Lün.).

Ver. 10. **In which will,** *etc.*—θέλημα is not the will and obedience of Christ (Calv., Justinian, Carpz., and others), but the purpose and counsel of God, which is to be regarded as a purpose of love conceived in eternity, carried out in time by means of the freewill offering of Christ, and in the Holy Scripture is to be recognized as an openly revealed plan. 'Εφάπαξ belongs not to προσφορᾶς (Œc., Schlicht., Stein, *etc.*), which construction would have required a repetition of the art., but to ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμέν, which expresses not one *subjective sanctification*, but one objective reception into true relationship to God, and into the actual fellowship of the members of the people of God as the ἅγιοι, ch. vi. 10; xiii. 24. The mediator of this relation is Christ, ὁ ἁγιάζων, ch. ii. 11.

VER. 11. **And while every priest, indeed, standeth,** *etc.*—The καί introduces a new antithesis—*to wit:* that between the never-ceasing, yet ever-ineffectual and unavailing service of the Jewish priests, and the regal repose of the Messiah, who, after accomplishing an expiation of never-failing efficacy, exalted above the need of further sacrifice, sits enthroned at the right hand of God. In the inner forecourt none was permitted to *sit;* it was only to those who held watch without that this privilege was accorded, while the designation of the Levitical service by the words, "and he stood before the face of Jehovah," is to be taken in its literal sense. A like contrast is expressed ch. i. 13 ff. in relation to the angels. Περιελεῖν, *to take away round about, from every side*, refers to the sin which begirts and encompasses man, ch. v. 2; xii. 1. Τὸ λοιπόν is the time still remaining until the *Parousia.* The parallelism of the clauses, and the progress of the thought, require our taking εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, ver. 12, not with the participial clause (Theophyl., Luth., Beng., Böhme, Lachm., *etc.*), but with ἐκάθισεν. The ἐφάπαξ of Christ's offering is the burden and crown of the thought, ver. 1–10; in vv. 11–14 the ever-during throne after a once forever completed sacrifice, occupies the foreground (Del.). The Perf. τετελείωκεν in connection with the Pres. Part. ἁγιαζομένους,

shows that here the reference is not to the *subjective perfection* of Christians reaching the end of life, and kept after the example of Jesus, by obedience in suffering (ch. v. 9; xii. 2); but to the translation of those who have become subjects of the high-priestly work of Christ, into that *condition of perfection objectively and eternally valid in the sight of God*, which the law, with its numerous and perpetually recurring rites and offerings, was unable to secure (ch. vii. 19; ix. 9; x. 1). The Scripture proof consists in a selection from the passage, Jer. xxxi. 31–34, already cited viii. 8–12.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The fact that the words of David, which, within the Old Testament itself, express not the *legal*, but *the evangelical idea* of sacrifice, are put into the mouth of Christ, as spoken on His entrance into the world, shows Christ in *self-conscious pre-existence*, destining Himself to be *a free-will offering* in perfect *obedience* to the will of the *Father*, whose will thus becomes *identical with that of the Son.*

2. The fact, still further, that even in the Old Testament obedience is put in *place* of animal sacrifices, and thus this also is declared to be a sacrifice, and, indeed, the true sacrifice, furnishes the Scripture proof of the doctrine, that Christ's voluntary *offering of Himself* in perfect and loving obedience, is the genuine sacrifice, *well pleasing to God*, to which prophecies and types point.

3. In the fact, finally, that Christ's offering of Himself has fulfilled the saving and loving will of God, not merely as *expressed* in Scripture, but as existing in His *determinate counsel*, the idea of sacrifice is realized; the purpose of God to institute an economy of salvation, based upon the expiation of sins by an efficacious sacrifice, is attained; and hence there is no further offering for sin, either in the same, or any different form, as evinced also by the express testimony of the Holy Spirit in Jeremiah.

4. When God places His *will—to wit:* the performance, by His servants, of that which He wills, positively as a *second* requisition, it appears in contrast with the first, *viz.*, the offering of external and symbolical sacrifices. But the offering of such sacrifices was itself a matter of express divine ordination; and thus a contradiction seems to emerge and an antagonism *within the sphere of the divine counsels and purposes themselves.* In truth, however, there is no contradiction between the two, but simply *a taking away* of the earlier system of the divine appointment *first*, and its *replacement* by the *second.* The transitory nature of the first is not merely *prefigured* by the symbolical character of the legal sacrifices themselves, but *expressly declared* within the very limits of the Old Testament revelation, partly by statements regarding the essential will of God, partly by the prediction of a new and perfect covenant. But in a merely outward offering God has *never* had pleasure. The fact of its being brought from the *property* of the worshipper, always had a reference to his personality and will. But even the voluntary offering of *things* stands in no equal or parallel relation to the entire person's *voluntary sacrifice of himself.* Thus the Old Testament utterances are, as to the matter of fact, in no way self-contradictory.

5. Our *transference* into a true saving and peace-imparting fellowship with God, or our objective sanctification is brought about by *the personal offering* of Jesus Christ upon the cross (Eph. v. 2); which offering is the fulfilment of *the essential will and eternal saving purpose of God, and has once for all accomplished* what was only shadowed forth by those typical sacrifices which year by year were offered by the priests who ministered before God, always the same, and of such quality that their impotence completely to take away sin was everywhere conspicuous.

6. The *waiting* of the Royal Priest, who is enthroned at the right hand of God, for the complete subjection of all His enemies, does not involve the idea of His personal inactivity until the time of His second coming, but expresses, in contrast with *that activity of the earthly priests which never attains to its end*, the exalted repose of the Mediator, who, *in every relation, has reached the goal of perfection;* who, after bringing to actual realization the ideal of propitiation which was typically announced in the Aaronic high-priesthood, now receives forever the position typically predicted in the royal priesthood of Melchisedek, a position exempted from future sacrifices, and fraught with unlimited homage, honor, and capacity for the bestowment of blessings.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The *efficient* cause of our salvation is the eternal gracious will of God; the *meritorious* cause is Jesus Christ with His personal sacrifice.—No creature had power to reconcile the world with God; but the *atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ* has rendered possible a perfect *taking away* of sin, and a *perfection* of the sanctified.—We have nothing to fear from any *hidden* purpose of God; we should rather regulate ourselves and all things according to His revealed will.—In Jesus Christ's offering of Himself for our redemption is evinced the perfect harmony of the *righteous* and the *gracious* will of God.—*The cross is the altar* on which Christ has offered, once for all, His blood for atonement, and His body for sanctification.—*Obedience* to the will of God not merely gives *value* to the sacrifice we bring, but is itself the best *sacrifice.*—How can the offering of sacrifices work the *forgiveness of sin?*

STARKE:—Sin must be, in the eyes of God, an evil overwhelmingly great, since by no other means, whether work, obedience, or sacrifice, can it be atoned for and done away, but only by the all-holy sacrifice of Christ, 1 Pet. i. 19; 1 John i. 18.—Jesus Christ is the only object revealed in the entire Scriptures to whom they can be pointed who would obtain forgiveness of sins and eternal blessedness, Acts x. 43.—The myriad sacrifices of the Old Testament could not have been, in the slightest degree, acceptable to God, except so far as they prefigured the perfect propitiatory offering of the Messiah, an offering of which He had long before smelled the sweet odor, Eph. v. 2.—See how willingly thy Jesus suffered for thee; shouldest thou then not again somewhat willingly suffer for

Him? John xviii. 4; 1 Pet. ii. 21.—No worship of God can be acceptable to God otherwise than in Christ.—The Divine service of the Old Testament was burdensome and oppressive; we cannot sufficiently thank God, that in Christ we are free from it. He who now will not serve God shall have all the less excuse, and heavier condemnation, Gal. v. 1.—We are under obligation to serve God every day, and can never serve Him sufficiently, Luke xvii. 10; Rev. vii. 15.—He who suffers with Christ, and conquers in Christ, will, with Christ, be gloriously exalted, 2 Tim. ii. 11, 12; Rev. iii. 21.—We may bid defiance to our enemies; in Christ shall we triumph; but they shall be overthrown and lie prostrate, Rom. viii. 34 ff.—Thou puttest faith in a trustworthy man; it were a shame not to believe the true God Himself, who has testified that the sacrifice of Christ alone suffices for our sins, 1 John v. 9.—To have the law of the Lord in our mouth merely, and make our boast of it, is nothing; but whoever has it written on his heart, and retains it, he is pleasing to God.

RIEGER.—What gave to the sacrifice of Jesus its everlasting value, is that in it all was executed according to the direction and will of God.—*Sanctification* comprehends all the different elements in the restoration of man, calling, justifying, glorifying.—The Holy Spirit also gladly interests and occupies himself with the gracious covenant of God on behalf of us poor sinners. He recognises with joy every forward step that we take therein.—The grace of Christ, the blessing of His single sacrifice, gives wide scope for the love of God, for His pleasure in us, the objects of His grace; and with the love of God comes a larger communion of the Holy Spirit.—The language of the Son has been, under the impulses of the Spirit of Christ, recorded in writing by holy men, and thus gradually grew up the whole Old Testament Scripture, together with the pledge and obligation therein recorded, of Him who was to come, and upon which, even on the cross, His attention was fixed, until He saw all had been accomplished.

SCHLEIERMACHER (*Festival Discourses*):—The death of the Redeemer, the end of all sacrifices: first, because there is needed no other remembrance of sin, which otherwise must have been renewed from day to day, and from year to year; but, secondly, because sin is now really taken away, and such insufficient provisional aids are no longer needed.

HEUBNER:—The value of our body, and of the whole sensible world, consists in their being means and instruments of the Holy Spirit.—God has had no pleasure in offerings which were made without repentance and faith; they could at best continue only till Christ; and finally, God regarded them merely as types.—The continued dominion of Christ amidst all the uprisings of His enemies, amidst all the endeavors against Him, His doctrine and His Church, is a pledge of our reconciliation, and of our ultimate completed blessedness.—Forgiveness of sins is the condition of our receiving the Holy Spirit.—Christ, with His holy suffering, love and perfect obedience is the one only thing wherein God can have infinite pleasure, and for the sake of which He can look graciously on the race of men.

MENKEN:—The divine majesty and universal dominion to which our perfected Mediator and High-Priest attained immediately on His entrance into the heavenly all-holy, stands in glorious contrast with the momentary and fearful waiting of the Levitical high-priest before the shadowy semblance of the divine throne; but it assures us, also, that we have in our eternal High-Priest in heaven all that we need for our salvation, and most complete perfection. He is all, and possesses all.

SECOND SECTION.

EXHORTATIONS, WARNINGS AND PROMISES, SUGGESTED BY THE PRECEDING DISCUSSION.

I.

A decided, steadfast and livingly attested adherence to the Christian faith in Christian fellowship is urgently enforced by a reference to the second coming.

CHAPTER X. 19–25.

19 Having therefore, brethren, boldness [confidence] to enter into the holiest by the
20 blood of Jesus, By a new and living way, which he hath [*om.* hath] consecrated [ini-
21 tiated ἐνεκαίνισεν] for us, through the vail, that is to say, his flesh; And *having* a high
22 priest [a great priest] over the house of God; Let us draw near with a true heart in

full assurance of faith, having [had] our hearts sprinkled[1] from an evil conscience;
23 and [having had] our bodies washed with pure water, Let us hold fast the profession
24 of *our* faith without wavering; for he *is* faithful that promised; And let us consider
25 one another to provoke unto love and to good works: Not forsaking the assembling of
ourselves together, as the manner of some *is;* but exhorting *one another:* and so much
the more, as ye see the day approaching.

[1] Ver. 22.—Cod. Sin. A. C. D*. write *ῥεραντισμένοι*.

[Ver. 19.—*ἔχοντες οὖν, having therefore*, emphatic in position.—*παῤῥησίαν, confidence, boldness.*—*εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων, for our entrance into* (lit., *the entrance of*) *the sanctuary;* E. Ver. "*the holiest*," right as to the substantial idea, though incorrect as to expression.

Ver. 20.—*ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδόν, which entrance he initiated for us, as a way, etc.*

Ver. 21.—*ἱερέα μέγαν* not a *high-priest*, but a *great, exalted priest.*

Ver. 22.—*ῥεραντισμένοι, having been sprinkled, λελυμένοι, having been washed.* These not *parts* of the exhortation, but *conditions* of it. The first clause to be connected with what precedes, the second with what follows.

Ver. 23.—*κατέχωμεν, let us hold our confession of faith unwavering; ἀκλινῆ* without article attached predicatively to *ὁμολογίαν*.

Ver. 25.—*τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν, our own* (synagogal) *assemblage;* the term being transferred from the synagogue to the Christian assemblies.—*βλέπετε, ye behold.*—K.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 19.—**Confidence to enter in,** *etc.*—The *παῤῥησία*, of which Christians as such find themselves in possession, is in this passage also not *freedom*, or *a rightful claim* (Erasm., Grot., *etc.*), but the joyful and confident spirit, which is *conscious and avails itself* of its right, and of its freedom in its assertion. The words *ἐν τῷ αἵματι* are not with Bl., Stier, *etc.*, to be referred barely to *εἴσοδον*, but to the whole clause; for the reference is not here, as ch. ix. 25, to the high-priestly entrance of Jesus (Heinrichs), nor to our entrance made through the blood of Jesus, but to our *παῤῥησία* in respect to the entrance, which *παῤῥησία* has its ground and origin in the blood of Jesus, Eph. iii. 12. This entrance, which forms the gate-way to the holiest of all, is, in its nature, an *ὁδὸς πρόσφατος καὶ ζῶσα*, and, as such, has been consecrated for our use by Jesus our *πρόδρομος*, vi. 20, and our *ἀρχηγός*, ii. 10. *Ἥν* is erroneously referred by Seb. Schmidt, Hammond, *etc.*, to *παῤῥησία*. The epithet *πρόσφατος—newly slaughtered*, now points to the fact that, previously non-existent, it has been originated by the sacrificial death of Jesus (Theodoret with the most), and not to its perpetual freshness (Ebr.). The term *ζῶσα, living*, emphasizes its vital power and internal efficacy, (Hofm. Del.); not its *end*, as producing life, (De Wette), nor its imperishableness (Bl.), nor the character of those who walk upon it (Stier, Ebr., *etc.*). The author is speaking not of a subjective relation of Christians, but of an *objective medium*, which is figuratively designated, on the one hand, as an *εἴσοδος*, on the other as a *ὁδός*, but by the added qualifying term is immediately withdrawn from the limitations of the imagery contained in the names to the sphere of the moral truths which the imagery represents. To this imagery belongs also the designation of the flesh of Jesus as a *veil through which* the new and living way leads into the holiest of all. The connection of *διὰ τοῦ καταπετ.* with *ἐνεκαίνισεν* (Schlicht., Böhm., Hofm., Del.), would require *διά* to be taken instrumentally; but the veil cannot be the *means* of consecration, or of the possibility of treading the way into the holiest of all; but requires to be done away, or *rent asunder*, in order to open an entrance for the church. We must, therefore, take *διά locally*, and connect it with *ὁδόν*, understanding *οὖσαν* or *ἄγουσαν*. [So also Alford. And yet the immediate addition of *σάρξ, flesh*, to *καταπέτασμα* would seem to render it probable that the author had his mind quite as much on the *instrumental* use of *διά* as the *local*. We enter through the veil locally, and through the flesh, *i. e.*, Christ's crucified body, instrumentally.—K.].

Ver. 21.—**A great priest over the house of God.**—Klee, Klein and others, take the words *ἱερέα μέγαν* together as = *high-priest*. But the priest whom we Christians have, is, as He who sits enthroned at the right hand of God as *rex sacerdotalis*, styled a *great* priest, exalted above every other priesthood, ch. iv. 14. By *οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ* Theophyl., Bl., De W., Lün., Riehm and others understand *heaven*, or the heavenly sanctuary; Theodoret, Œc., Calov, Este, Thol., Ebr. and others, the household of believers, the family of the children of God; while Del. would unite both conceptions. The former reference has in its favor the above-mentioned *εἴσοδος τῶν ἁγίων* and the designation of Christ as *λειτουργός* (viii. 2) of the heavenly sanctuary, (com. ix. 11) to whose *permanent* priestly function the writer makes frequent reference. [In favor of the other explanation is the writer's use of *οἶκος*, ch. iii. 2 ff., which is applied to the church founded by Moses, and to the New Testament church founded by Christ, but which is nowhere in the Epistle (unless here) applied to the Sanctuary. The latter meaning, too, is equally in harmony with the connection, and in fact more directly calculated to inspire the hope and confidence which the writer is now striving to awaken. The import of the phrase may be doubtful, but I incline to prefer the latter.—K.].

Ver. 22.—**Having had our hearts sprinkled,** *etc.*—The writer has previously stated clearly the two great prerogatives enjoyed by Christians, which furnish not merely an *objective possibility*, but also the *practical inducement and motive* for approaching and drawing near to God. He now mentions first the *subjective condition* in which the *προσέρχεσθαι* can and must take place *viz:* that of a *true heart* *ἐπ' ἀληθινῆς καρδίας* (בְּלֵב שָׁלֵם) (Is. xxxviii. 3) *ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως*, and then in a participial clause, their *actual fitness* for this. The sprinkling which reaches the heart, and the consequence of which is styled the doing away in us of an *evil conscience*

—purification from guilt is, evidently sprinkling with *the Blood of Christ*, ch. ix. 14; xii. 24; 1 Pet. i. 2, whereby the expiatory offering up of His life is *appropriated to the person*, and He, as freed from the stain of sins, is enabled to appear in priestly service before God; as also the priests of the Old Covenant received, at their consecration, a like sprinkling with blood (Ex. xxix. 21; Lev. viii. 30); nay, in the making of the Old Covenant, the whole people were sprinkled with the blood of the covenant sacrifice (Ex. xxiv. 8). We thus refer the language, not to sanctification (Beng., Menk., Stier), but to *justification* on the ground of a propitiation.

Ver. 23.—**And having had our bodies washed**, *etc.*—Another form of Levitical cleansing and sanctifying was washing with pure water, which Aaron and his sons likewise had to submit to at their consecration (Ex. xxix. 4): to which also the priests, as often as they went into the Sanctuary, submitted their hands and feet, from the brazen vessel or laver, before the entrance into the holy place (Ex. xxx. 20 ff.; xl. 20 ff.); but to which the high-priest, on the annual day of atonement, submitted his whole body, Lev. xvi. 4. To this rite allusion is evidently made, and as shown by the word σῶμα, we are not, with Calv. and others to take the *water* according to Ezech. xxxvi. 25, as a symbol of the outpouring of the Spirit, or as indicating washing away of sins generally (Limb. Ebr., *etc.*), and least of all with direct reference to the blood of Christ, (Reuss). We must recognize expressly *a reference to baptism*, Eph. v. 26: Tit. iii. 5. For baptism forms the transition point from the objective system of salvation to its subjective appropriation through the grace which by virtue of the Divine arrangement it sacramentally imparts, and contains in itself the *obligation* to holiness on the part of the reconciled and justified, Rom. vi. 8 ff.; 1 Pet. iii. 21; and also actually *works* the washing away of sin, Acts xxii. 16; 1 Cor. vi. 11. Grammatically this clause forms the transition from the first to the second part of the exhortation, which would utterly lack connection, if the two participial clauses, were both of them referred either to the preceding προσερχώμεθα (Pesh., Primas., Luth., Bl., De W., Del., *etc.*), or to the following κατέχωμεν, (Hofm.). In favor too of this connection of καὶ λελου. with κατέχωμεν (as held by Thol., Lün., *etc.*) is the fact that with baptism stands connected the ὁμολογία, which may signify just as well the active confessing of the hope, as the passive profession, whose object is the Christian hope. The clause assigning the reasons for steadfastness reminds us of 1 Cor. i. ix.; x. 13; 1 Thess. v. 24; 2 Thess. iii. 3.

Ver. 24.—**And let us give heed to one another**, *etc.*—The third part of the exhortation, similarly adjoined by καί, refers to the *duty of love* toward the members of the church, in special reference to their position at the time, while the first has to do with *faith* and the second with *hope*. The purpose of their mutual and watchful regard is a παροξυσμός, which, (while elsewhere in the New Testament, denoting stirring up and irritation in a bad sense Acts xv. 39; 1 Cor. xiii. 5) here as sometimes in the classics, the following Gen. shows to be employed in a good sense.

Ver. 25.—**Not forsaking**, *etc.*—The words apply neither to a neglect of duty toward the church (Bl.), nor to the forsaking of her when involved in peril, distress and need (Böhm.). For ἐπισυναγωγή never signifies the Christian body (Calv., Just., Bl., *etc.*) but only *assembly, congregation* (2 Macc. ii. 7; 2 Thess. ii. 1), and it is only the ἑαυτῶν that restricts this to the readers, as a Christian and worshipping assembly (Chrys. and the most). The incidental clause ὡς ἔθος τισίν shows that the withdrawal from the religious assemblages had with some already begun, yet that no "formal apostasy is meant, but only a neglect, marking an abatement of zeal at no wide remove from apostasy," (Del.). The day of Christ's re-appearing is called here as 1 Cor. iii. 13 simply "the day" (ἡ ἡμέρα). The ὅσῳ is to be constructed not with ἐγγίζουσαν, but with βλέπετε=ὅσῳ μᾶλλον.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Christians find themselves in possession of two important advantages, which not merely *establish the possibility*, but furnish a *practical living inducement* to draw near to God. These advantages are: 1, the joyful and confident *boldness* to make use of the entrance to the formerly closed, but now opened heavenly sanctuary; 2, the *Priest* over the house of God, *exalted* above every priesthood, Jesus Christ.

2. This boldness is found only within *the sphere of the influence, and in the power of the blood*, of Jesus Christ. For during the life of Jesus Christ on earth, His flesh had the same influence as the veil between the outer and inner sanctuary of the Temple. Full and unobstructed communion with God had in this a barrier which must first be overcome, but which was completely removed in the sacrificial death of Christ. Thus it becomes apparent also here that it is not the *doctrine and example of Jesus* that render possible our communion with God, but the *death of the God-man*, which, in its connection with atonement and propitiation, as indicated by the train of thought through the entire Epistle, can neither be the mere figurative representation of an idea, nor have a simply *moral* significance. Our way to God leads always through this *rent veil* of the flesh of Jesus Christ, which is the henceforth unveiled and ever open gateway to heaven.

3. Since Christ has gone into heaven, in order therein to *remain*, and there, as in the true sanctuary, on the ground of His completed work of redemption, to *appear in the presence of God for us*, the exercise of His Priestly office in mediation, intercession and blessing, takes place *in the most perfect manner*, and *without interruption*. It only remains now that we, as His ransomed Church, gather ourselves thither unto Him.

4. Before we are called to appear before God in eternity, we should so avail ourselves in time of the means of access to the heavenly sanctuary, that the characteristic marks of Christians, in faith, hope and love, shall be found in us. *Faith* gains its fulness from the sprinkling of the heart with the blood of Jesus Christ, whereby are produced the certainty of our reconciliation

with God, and the experience of our justification. *Hope*, which expresses itself in holding fast our confession of specifically Christian faith, finds its warrant in the appropriation of the grace of baptism, and draws its nourishment from the promises of the one only reliable and faithful God. *Love*, whose rights and obligations lie in the needs and blessings of communion and fellowship, finds occasion, stimulus and strength for its exercise in participation in Christian worship, and has its living connection with faith and love in awaiting and preparing for the approaching day of the Lord's return.

5. Since the ascension of Jesus Christ, the day which ends the circling round of days and merges time into eternity, is not merely apprehended by itself as in a sort of standing and perpetual proximity, but is expected by the disciples as *approaching*, with the conviction that every new morning may possibly be the last; and with the feeling that those who are called and are qualified to judge the signs of the times (Matth. xxiv.) may by no means overlook the premonitory signs, occurring in history, of the coming of this decisive day of judgment and salvation.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The wishes, thoughts and ways of the Christian tend not merely into the *earthly*, but into the *heavenly* sanctuary.—Our drawing near to God: 1, in its basis and foundation; 2, in its means; 3, in its blessings.—The right use of the *means of grace:* 1, in their quality; 2, in their effects.—How we have to dispense the *gifts of grace* imparted to us beneficially *to ourselves and to others.*—Whereby we make every day a day of blessing.—We need not fear the final judgment, if we rightly improve the present time.—We must not merely *expect* the day of the Lord, but *prepare* ourselves for it.—How we overcome the *perils of society* by the *blessings of Christian fellowship.*—How we must recompense *fidelity with fidelity.*—The *character* of those who would come to God.—The connection of *faith, hope* and *love* in the life of the true Christian.—To the *nature* of the way opened to us into the heavenly sanctuary, should our *walk* in it correspond.

STARKE:—A Christian must conduct with great thoroughness and gentleness his admonitions to his neighbor.—Faith in Christ is the way to God.—Christ is the great High-priest in respect: 1, to His person; 2, to His office; 3, to believers, of whom He is the Head.—Whoever would be great, and have what is great, must make choice of Jesus.—If the heart has rightly apprehended the grace of God, and believes that Christ is a living, gracious, kind and sweet Saviour, it also so uses that grace, and so feels the attraction of the love of the Lord Jesus, that it penetrates even to His gracious seat.—The way to heaven can be entered by him only who has a living faith in his Saviour, holds constantly to his confession of hope, and has a zeal that provokes to love and good works.—Neither doubter nor despairer can enter into the kingdom of God.—The faithfulness of God is above all faithfulness. God is faithful to fulfil what He has promised, and to guard what He has given. Should not this furnish to our faith and hope a double basis for a joyful confession?—One Christian must be guardian of another, and rebuke with words whatever runs counter to God and virtue.—Every one must look first to himself, and seek in all respects to make a certain advancement, and keep and increase what he has: but this same well regulated self-love he must also evince for his neighbor, on the ground of a common membership in the spiritual body of Jesus Christ.—Mere external contact with the worship of God fails indeed to secure salvation; but wilful contempt of it is the way to ruin and damnation.—The diligent contemplation of the displays of God's punitive justice in death and the final judgment, may and should serve us as a perpetual discipline in godliness.

RIEGER:—The pure water of baptism has drawn our body and its members into the service of the Lord, and also raised it to the dignity of a future resurrection. It is, therefore, a capital point in the hope that has been bestowed on us, and to which we must adhere, that even in our body which has wrung from us many sighs over sin and death, we shall yet be penetrated and pervaded by the salvation of God.—Love draws great quickening from hope; but by the exercise of love, hope again gains ever wider scope.—Without fervent zeal in ourselves, mutual admonition is of no account.

HAHN:—He in whom is the life of Christ, has also the entrance into the sanctuary.—By faith our spirit has, even in the present life, an entrance into the sanctuary; but God has, in baptism, also appropriated to himself our body as that in which the life of Christ is to be made manifest.

HEUBNER:—God ever vouchsafes to the believer the privilege of approach; is ever accessible, ever to be addressed.—Our hope itself, and more than this, our confession of hope also, we should ever hold fast.—How deeply have Christians to reflect on what has been bestowed on them with Christ and His death.

THOLUCK:—How, in our own time, are we to consider the forsaking of the Christian assemblies? *a*, in its causes; *b*, in its consequences.

MENKEN:—That the way has been consecrated for us, indicates our right to walk in it; and also an obligation resting on us not to decline walking in it.—Not in the Spirit, not in His higher nature and dignity, not in so far as He was in the form and essential likeness of God, has the Son of God consecrated for men the living way into the holiest of all; but rather in so far as He has humbled himself to the form of a servant in our sinful flesh, and in the flesh has suffered and conquered.—From the signs of the times, from the rent veil, from the opened sanctuary, we see that the first grand division of our world's history has past by, and in a sense and measure, such as never before, the day of the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ draws near.

GEROK:—Of our sacred priestly obligations: 1, Priestly approach to the mercy seat; 2, the priestly sprinkling of our hearts; 3, the priestly holding fast to our confession of hope; 4, the priestly receiving of one another in love.

II.

The heaviest and inevitable judgment of God falls upon apostasy from acknowledged Christian truth.

CHAPTER X. 26–31.

26 For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there
27 remaineth no more [a] sacrifice for sins, But a certain fearful looking for of judgment
and [a] fiery indignation, which shall [the glowing fervor of a fire that is about to]
28 devour the adversaries. He that despised [set at naught] Moses' law died [dieth]
29 without mercy under two or three witnesses: Of how much sorer punishment,
suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God,
and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy
thing [common, unhallowed, κοινόν], and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?
30 For we know him that hath [*om.* hath] said, Vengeance *belongeth* unto me, I will
recompense, saith the Lord.[1] And again, The Lord shall [will] judge[2] his people.
31 *It is* a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.

[1] Ver. 30.—The words λέγει κύριος are wanting, indeed, in Sin. D*. 17, 23*, 67**, and most ancient translations, but have the authority of A. D. E. K. L. Philox., and are added by a later hand in Sin. Comp. Expos. of ver. 29, conclusion.

[2] Ver. 30.—Instead of the *lect. rec.* κύριος κρινεῖ, we are to read κρινεῖ κύριος after Sin. A. D. E. K. 31, 73, which MSS., except Sin. and A., have also ὅτι preceding, as Sept., Deut. xxxii. 36; Ps. cxxxv. 14. In the Sin., the change has been introduced by the corrector.

[Ver. 26.—ἑκουσίως γάρ, *for voluntarily*, ἑκουσ. emphatically standing before the Part.—ἁμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν, *we sinning*, in case of our sinning—the present Part. denoting an habitual and abiding state; but nothing seems to require us to transfer it, with Alf., to the actual day of judgment. It seems much more forcible, as well as more natural, to refer it to the condition, in the present life, of one who has completely apostatized from God.—μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν, *after receiving.*—τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν, *the recognition*—more than the mere γνῶσις—the knowledge to which the mind has been consciously directed, and borne, as it were, its attestation.—ἀπολείπεται, *there remaineth* as a logical result: καταλείπεται, *there is left behind as a historical fact*, see ch. iv. 1, 4.

Ver. 27.—Πυρὸς ζῆλος ἐσθίειν μέλλοντος, *an indignation*, or, *fervor of fire that is about to devour.*

Ver. 28.—ἀθετήσας τις, *any one, after setting at naught.*

Ver. 29.—ὁ καταπατήσας, *who trampled on*—κοινόν, *common*, that of a common man (De W., Del., Alf., *etc.*), or (as Thol., Lün., Moll, *etc.*),—ἀκάθαρτον, *unclean, impure.*—K.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 26. **For if we sin wilfully,** *etc.*—That the reference here is not to deliberate and heinous sins in general, but to apostasy from Christianity after regeneration, is clear from the entire phraseology. Ἑκουσίως stands in contrast with ἀγνοοῦντες and πλανώμενοι, ch. v. 2: the pres. ἁμαρτανόντων marks *habitual* in contrast with transient denial: the apostasy is *preceded* by the ἐπίγνωσις τῆς ἀληθείας, at once a theoretical and practical recognition of the truth, and deliberate and conscious embracing of it, and is *followed* by a failure of any further expiatory sacrifice, and instead of it (ἀπολείπεται, as ch. iv. 6) an ἐκδοχή, whose fearfulness is heightened by the rhetorical τίς. Πυρὸς ζῆλος is not to be taken as a single conception=*fiery zeal* or *jealousy* (Luth., *etc.*), since the following Part. takes the case of πυρός, which is treated as a person, as at ch. xii. 29 God Himself is called πῦρ καταναλίσκον. Ἐσθίειν points not to a destroying=annihilating, but to the sensible conscious suffering of the fiery infliction. The expressions remind us forcibly of Is. xxvi. 11 in the Sept. The words in ver. 28 refer evidently to Deut. xvii. 6, which refer in like manner not to the transgression of individual commandments, but to a breaking of the covenant, and abandonment of God for idol-worship. Hence the ground for the following parallel.

VER. 29. **Of how much sorer punishment think ye,** *etc.*—Δοκεῖτε lays the decision regarding the case, about which there can be no doubt, on the judgment of the readers: ἀξιωθήσεται represents God as Him who weighs the greatness of guilt, and hence awards the τιμωρία according to the facts of the preceding (Aor. Part.) sins. The words ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη (as read uniformly except by A. and Chrys.) designate the blood of the covenant as that whose sanctifying influence—*i. e.*, an influence which, *in virtue of the atonement and purification, consecrates to a true covenant fellowship* with God and His people—had been already experienced. Hence κοινόν here, doubtless, denotes *impurity* (Vulg., Luth., Grot., Thol., Ebr., Lün., Riehm, *etc.*), not *commonness* (Pesh., It., Œcum., Theophyl., Bez., Schlicht., Beng., Bl., De W., Bisp., Del., *etc.*). By πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος Bl., De W., Lün. understand the Holy Spirit as the gift of grace; but more correctly acc. to ch. xiii. 9, 25 (comp. Zech. xii. 10). Böhm., Del., Riehm, *etc.*, understand it as the *efficient principle* of grace. The first citation is from Deut. xxxii. 35; the second from Deut. xxxii. 36 (repeated Ps. cxxxv. 14). In both passages the sentiment is, that Jehovah, by His

judicial sway, will vindicate the rights of His people against His enemies. This meaning of the original is also here to be maintained, since *τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ* denotes in the conception of the writer the church of God of the New Covenant (Del.), which is overlooked by Bl., De W., Lün., who understand the words of a judgment *upon* the people, instead of *for* them. The first citation deviates from the Heb. text, and still more from that of the Sept.; but accords with Rom. xii. 19, which contains also the *λέγει κύριος* that is wanting in the original. Hence Bl., De W., Del., Reiche infer that the citation was taken at second hand from Romans; while Meyer (Rom. xii. 19, 3d ed.) regards the paraphrase of Onkelos, Lün., on the contrary, a current *proverbial* form of the expression, as the common source of the citation both here and in Romans.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The most immediate *inducement* to follow the injunctions that in their rightful claim have just been laid down, is the *great danger* of apostasy from Christ, and *the fearfulness of its consequences.*

2. The *penitent* sinner may indeed, with resigned spirit, choose rather to fall into the hands of God than of men, 2 Sam. xxiv. 14; Sir. ii. 18. But the *covenant-breaker* and apostate, who has come into a hostile and radical gainsaying of the truth which he had before acknowledged, *cannot be again renewed to repentance*, ch. vi. 4-8, and cannot possibly henceforth obtain forgiveness of sins. The offerings of the law bring no *true propitiation;* self-originated offerings have not even the character of *type* and of *promise.* If the only true atoning sacrifice, the Son of God and His blood, have in view of the earlier experience of its sanctifying power, been rejected as useless, and the Spirit of grace spurned and scorned, not only is there nothing to *replace* the sacrifice thus rejected and dishonored, but this itself can no longer exercise a *saving influence* upon him who has made wilful and wanton wreck of all the previous influences of grace.

3. The distinction of *peccatum deliberatum* and *ignorantiæ* is a less fixed and rigid one than is commonly supposed: there is in sinning a knowledge of the right, which the sinner refuses to allow to assert itself. The veil of the lying excuse which is drawn over the conscience would fain lift itself, but is held fast with convulsive power. Such a character of the inward struggle and gainsaying of truth must we particularly insist on when Christian truth, once attested by the Holy Spirit, is, in an apostasy which has grown out of lesser acts of infidelity, not only denied, but blasphemed. The conflict regarding objective truth becomes all the more fierce in proportion as there is, at the same time, a conflict against the truth which still in a measure asserts itself within the bosom of the apostate (Thol. comp. *Stud. und Krit.*, 1836, *Heft.* 2).

4. Rightfully and justly after such an apostasy, nothing remains to be expected but *judgment*, which will be executed by God with the full *living energy* of His holy nature, just as inevitably as His undeceiving word has infallibly *declared* it; and its fearfulness will stand proportionate to the richness of the grace, and the fulness of the revelation, of the New Covenant.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

To the *greatness* of the grace which has been received we find standing in direct relation the *guilt* of apostasy, and the *fearfulness* of the punishment.—The hands of *God* reach through time and eternity, and to apostates bring no less of terror and destruction, than comfort and assistance to believers.—The *judgments of God* come slowly but surely; yet they are preceded by the *proffer* of grace and the *announcement* of punishment upon the despisers.—He who turns the grace of God into *wantonness* has nothing further to hope from His compassion.—The *looking for* of the Divine judgment, without faith in the expiatory sacrifice of Jesus Christ, is a *foretaste* of damnation.—The *wrath* of God burns as *hotly* as His love, and strikes no less surely than justly.

Starke:—Were there to be another sacrifice, there must also be another Messiah; and God must lay through Him an entirely new foundation for salvation; must institute an entirely different economy for attaining it; and must consequently, at the same time, Himself take away the way which has been disclosed, and the foundation which has been laid, through Christ. Inasmuch, therefore, as this is absolutely impossible, it is also equally impossible that any one should be saved out of Christ; and that any other propitiatory sacrifice should be made on his behalf.—Not only is the judgment of God terrible in itself, but terrible is also the tormenting fear and foretaste of it which the ungodly feel in themselves as a hell even upon earth.—Great sins deserve great punishments; he therefore who allows himself in their commission must not be surprised that he receive his reward (Jer. ii. 19).—Against the apostate there are three witnesses: the Father, who hath given to him His Son; the Son, whose blood he tramples under foot; and the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of grace, to whom he does despite.—Seest thou the apostate and ungodly walking secure, believe that he will not remain unpunished; God does all precisely at the right time; he will thus speedily remember him (Nah. i. 2).

Hahn:—According to the greatness of His grace, is the severity with which God visits His wrath upon the contempt of it.

Rieger:—To the Lord Jesus is ascribed a long-suffering patience (ch. x. 13), but to believers a hopeful waiting (ch. ix. 28): unbelievers, on the contrary, fall into a fearful apprehension, wherein many a word of God that had been heard without fear, returns with terrible power.—The unfruitful vine before every other tree is given as food to the fire (Ezek. xv. 6, 7); and thus abused love and neglected grace awaken all the greater wrath.—It is a great deception of our hardened and insensible heart that the death-punishments threatened in the law, stoning, *etc.*, affect us more than the sorer punishment which takes effect only in the realm of the future and invisible.—"He who eats my bread, tramples me with his heel," is the just complaint of Jesus in regard to His betrayer.

HEUBNER:—There is a more subtle and a more open apostasy.—The abandonment of the only Saviour and Propitiator takes us out of the reach of propitiation.—The apostate suffers a twofold punishment; first, in awaiting it, and then in the actual experience.—We hear in this case an earnest testimony to the guilt of careless and unprincipled changes in religion.

MENKEN:—In that the Lord judges His people He will avenge and deliver them.—Vengeance is a prerogative of the Divine majesty. This we are not to assume, but rather to refrain from all private vengeance, and, feeling the love of Jesus Christ, are to commend to the Divine compassion those who in thought and act oppose themselves to Christianity, and who are our enemies for the Gospel's sake; and this all the more from the fact that they who from this cause, hate, calumniate and abuse us, unless they cease from their unrighteousness, will not escape the Divine retribution.

III.

A speedy entrance into blessedness awaits those who endure to the end; of which the readers inspire a hope by the steadfastness which they have already evinced.

CHAPTER X. 32–39.

32 But call to remembrance the former days, in which, after ye were illuminated, ye
33 endured a great fight [struggle] of afflictions; Partly, whilst ye were made a gazing-
stock both by reproaches and afflictions; and partly, whilst ye became companions of
34 them that were so used [that so walked]. For ye had compassion of me in my bonds
[sympathized with those in bonds, τοῖς δεσμίοις][1] and took joyfully the spoiling of your
goods, knowing in yourselves that [that for yourselves][2] ye have in heaven a better
35 and an enduring substance. Cast not away therefore your confidence, which hath
36 great recompense of reward. For ye have need of patience [steadfastness, ὑπομονῆς],
that, after ye have done [*or*, by doing=ye may do—and] the will of God, ye might
37 [may] receive the promise. For yet a little while [a very little], and he that shall
38 come [he that cometh, ὁ ἐρχόμενος] will come, and will not tarry. Now the just [But
my just one][3] shall live by faith, but if *any man* [and if he] draw back, my soul shall
39 have [hath] no pleasure in him. But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving [procuring, preserving] of the soul [of life].

[1] Ver. 34.—Instead of the *lect. rec.* τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου, found in D***. E. K. L. (but recognized even by Este as an expanded gloss on the erroneous τοῖς δεσμοῖς of ORIG. *Exhort. ad mart.*, 44) we are to read τοῖς δεσμίοις after A. D*., whose testimony is the more important, as B. and C. are here defective. Sin. however, has the *lect. rec.*

[2] Ver. 34.—Instead of the illy attested *lect. rec.* ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, we are either with Sin. and many minusc. to read ἑαυτούς, or better, with D. E. K. L., ἑαυτοῖς: with this accords best also the circumstance that ἐν οὐρανοῖς is wanting in A. D*., 17, but on the contrary is found in D***. E. K. L.

[3] Ver. 38.—After δίκαιος we are with Sin. A. Vulg., *etc.*, and the Cod. Alex. of the Sept. to retain μου. In D*., the two Syriac and other ancient versions and most MSS. of the Sept., it stands after πίστεως. The Rec., without reason, omits it entirely. The failure of this pron. in the Heb. text does not decide for the Gr. text.

[Ver. 32.—ἀναμιμνήσκεσθε, *Be calling*, or, *keep calling to remembrance*, as a habit; so Pres. tense; not Aor. ἀναμνήσθητε, *call to remembrance*, as a simple act.—ἄθλησιν, *struggle*, *contest*, requiring exertion; not μάχην, *fight*, *battle*.—παθημάτων, *sufferings*, not *afflictions* (θλίψεων) as in next verse.

Ver. 33.—τοῦτο μέν, *on the one hand* (lit., *as to this indeed*).—θεατριζόμενοι, Pres. Part. *being habitually made a spectacle*, γενηθέντες, Aor. *being made*, or *becoming*, as a single fact.—τῶν οὕτως ἀναστρεφομένων, *of them who so walk*, *i. e.*, *in reproaches and afflictions*.

Ver. 34.—τοῖς δεσμίοις συνεπαθήσατε, *ye sympathized with the prisoners*.—γινωσ. ἔχειν ἑαυτοῖς, *knowing that ye have for yourselves*; not, as E. V., *knowing in yourselves*.

Ver. 35.—ἥτις, characteristic, *as one which* hath=*because it hath*.

Ver. 36.—ὑπομονῆς, *of patient endurance*.—ἵνα τὸ θελ. τοῦ θεοῦ ποιήσαντες κομίσησθε E. V. (In order) *that after ye have done the will of God, ye may receive the promises*. So Moll substantially, "after fulfilment of the will of God, ye may receive," *etc.* ALFORD: "that ye may do the will of God and receive=that doing the will of God, ye may receive." De Wette: *durch Erfüllung*, by fulfilment of, by doing the will, *etc.* The sentence will equally well bear either of the three constructions: 1. "that, after doing the will, ye may receive;" 2. that, doing the will, ye may receive=ye may do the will and receive; 3. "that doing the will ye may receive= that, *by* doing the will, ye may receive." Either, too, here makes perfectly good sense. For although Alford's rendering, "ye may do and receive," is entirely admissible, and may be the right one, yet his reason for rejecting the first, is scarcely decisive, *viz.* "No endurance, or patience would be wanted, when they had done the will of God, to receive the promise." True, but endurance or patience *would* be wanted to bring about *that state of things* in which they, after having done the will of God, might receive the promise. For such is the character of the sentence that the endurance *might* have reference exclusively to the participial clause, or to the finite verb, or to both together, and nothing but the connection could determine which.

Ver. 37.—*μικρὸν ὅσον, ὅσον*, more emphatic than "a little," as E. V.; "a little, a very little"—the repeated ὅσον being a sort of double diminutive, "*aliquantillum*."—*ὁ ἐρχόμενος, he that cometh;* not, as E. V., *he that shall come;* nor, as often rendered in the gospels, *he that should come.*

Ver. 38.—*ὁ δὲ δίκαιός μου, but my righteous one* (*μου* here being guaranteed by the best authorities).—*καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, and if he shall have shrunk back, timidly drawn back* (lit. ὑποστέλλεσθαι, *lower sail, take in sail,* then, *shrink back from danger*, as often in the classics). Eng. ver. supplies (with many) *τις, if any man*, contrary to the spirit of the passage, although, if the exigencies of the connection required it, it would be quite defensible grammatically. *τις* (with Middleton and Scholefield) is, I think, to be supplied at John viii. 44, with λάλῃ, although the commentators generally decline to receive it. *Here* the reference of ὑποστείληται to the δίκαιος, is only one more among many passages of like import in this Epistle.

Ver. 39.—*οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς, we do not belong to back-sliding.—εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς, for*, or *unto* the *procuring, gaining, preserving of the soul*—or of our *life* in the sense of Matth. x. 39, *he that findeth his life* (τὴν ψυχήν) *shall lose it.* And so better, I think, with Moll, De Wette, *etc.*, than *soul*, with Luther, Stier, Alford, *etc.*—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 32. **But calling to mind,** *etc.*—Ἀναμνησθῆναι is usually constructed with the Acc. of the remembered object, the simple *μνησθῆναι* with the Gen. *φωτισθέντες, enlightened,* denotes conversion to Christianity as a translation from the power of darkness into the realm of light, so that the truth has found recognition and efficient action in the soul, and Christ is not merely believed in and praised as the Light of the world, but shines in the soul, as the Sun of Righteousness.—Excellently Chrys., in regard to the conflict of suffering; *οὐκ εἶπε πειρασμοὺς ἀλλὰ ἄθλησιν ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐγκωμίου ὄνομα καὶ ἐπαίνων μεγίστων* ("he does not say *temptations*, but *struggle*, a term of high eulogy").—The *οὕτως* is by some referred to walking in 'steadfastness,' by most to walking in 'affliction.' The latter only is admissible, in the subordination of the two clauses, *τοῦτο μέν—τοῦτο δέ* to *ὑπομείνατε*, as exhibiting the different modes of their manifested 'endurance.' The *οὕτως* in the second division can only refer to the characteristic mentioned in the preceding. The *τοῦτο μέν—τοῦτο δέ*, found in the New Testament only here, is thoroughly classic.

Ver. 36. **After fulfilling the will of God.**—Beng. erroneously refers the Aor. Part. *ποιήσαντες* to the previously mentioned Christian acts of the readers immediately after their conversion. [Grammatically considered, the passage might bear this, although I think the Perf. Part. would then be more natural. At all events, the *ποιήσαντες* undoubtedly refers to acts hereafter to be done under the influence of the *ὑπομονή*. But even then, whether the better rendering is, "after doing," or "by doing," or by two co-ordinate verbs, "may do and receive," is doubtful. Substantially, they would here amount to the same thing; though in other cases of like construction, the difference might be important. But then the context would generally decide the right construction.—K.]. The will of God is here not as ch. x. 7 ff. God's purpose and counsel of redemption, whose fulfilment became the great end of the life of Christ, but the will of God, as required to be fulfilled by the Saints, not, however, in its most general character, as a simple rule of life (Thol., and others); nor as restricted to the sanctification which is effected through the sacrifice of the Son (Bl.); but in special reference to steadfast endurance unto the end (Theophyl., Lün., Del.).

The *promise* (*ἐπαγγελία*) is here, as in several other places, the *substance* of the promise, the thing promised.

Ver. 37. **For yet a little—how little time,** *etc.*—The words *μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον=a little, how very, very little!* which form one of the very few instances in which the superlative is expressed in Greek by repetition, are probably taken from Is. xxvi. 20; and in their connection with *ἔτι* are in our passage, like *ἔτι μικρόν*, John xiv. 19, better regarded as an independent Subst. clause than as an Acc. of determinate time employed to introduce the freely cited passage, Hab. ii. 3, 4. The original text runs: "If it delays (*viz.*, the vision) wait for it; it comes, it comes, it will not linger." The subject is the overthrow of the Chaldean world-dominion by the judgment of Jehovah. The Sept. itself suggests the turn of the passage, so as to apply it to a *person* by the rendering *ὅτι ἐρχόμενος ἥξει*, which our author makes still more concrete by adding the def. article. The original then adds: "Lo! his soul is puffed up, is not upright within him (the Chaldean);" the Sept., on the contrary; "If he timidly draws back, my soul hath no pleasure in him" (Ὑποστέλλειν, used originally of *lowering the sail*, then of timidly shrinking back). On this follows the clause: "But the righteous will live, *ἐκ πίστεώς μου*," (Cod. Vat.); or, "But my righteous one will live," *ἐκ πίστεως* (Cod. Alex.). Grot. supplies *τὶς*, De W. *ἄνθρωπος*. Calvin carries the fact that the passage aims not to be a direct and proper citation, but simply a free application of the original, to the extent of putting the concluding clause into the mouth of the author, and understanding by *ἡ ψυχή μου* the soul, not of God, or (as Œc.) of Christ, but of the author. With *ἐσμέν* Grot., Carpz., and others supply *τέκνα* or *υἱοί*. It is better taken in the strictly classical Gr. construction of a Gen. of *belonging*. The allusion to *ζήσεται*, and the contrasted *ἀπώλεια* shows that *περιποίησις ψυχῆς* is not, with Luth., Calv., *etc.*, to be taken of the *soul;* while still we are not, with Ebr., to refer it to *temporal bodily life* in escaping from the impending destruction of Jerusalem, but, of *eternal life*, corresponding to the expression, 1 Thess. v. 9, *εἰς περιποίησιν σωτηρίας*.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. A *second* inducement to follow the admonitions of vv. 19–25 lies in the encouraging remembrance of the steadfastness evinced under previous sufferings; a steadfastness which is still to be maintained in faith, and which is accompanied by great promises that will be perfectly fulfilled at the re-appearing of Jesus Christ.

2. Conversion to Christ, inasmuch as it introduces into the soul *the true light of life*, gives, indeed, to the believer, through the beams of this gracious luminary, *the certainty of reconciliation*, and, along with the acknowledgment of the truth, at the same time, an *experience of salvation;* whence come at once quiet to the heart, repose to the conscience, and peace to the soul.

But as even the converted man still remains in the world, there arises, ere long, a great and perpetually recurring struggle amid sufferings. By insults and afflictions, endured partly in their own persons, and partly by sympathy with those companions in faith who pursue their Christian walk amidst like circumstances of suffering, the children of God are made a spectacle of derision to the world.

3. In the case of apostasy the sacrifices already offered would have been offered in vain; and the sufferings hitherto endured, would have been endured to no purpose. He, on the contrary, who remains steadfast in the appointed conflict of suffering, not merely receives an *experimental testimony* of the power of faith, but also acquires thereby courage and strength, and the invigoration of hope, and *final victory*.

4. The assurance of *imperishable* and *inalienable* possessions, not only aids us in relation to the loss of our earthly goods, but renders believers even *joyful sufferers* under acts of violence, and *willing sharers* in the sufferings of the oppressed. For suffering for the name of Jesus, and on account of a conscience that owes allegiance to God, is an honor and a favor (Acts v. 41; 1 Pet. ii. 20).

5. The recompense of reward comes as certainly as *the Lord Himself, who is already on the way*. But as the securing of life is certain to those who persevere in the faith, equally certain is the destruction of those who timidly draw back. *Faith* thus, in its abiding confidence in the Lord, is the *essential condition* of the attainment of salvation, of which *the coming of the Lord* is the *essential means*. But believers are strengthened in their conflict of suffering, and in their waiting for the fulfilment of the promises of God, particularly by the assurance and clear view, that the period of waiting for the dawning of glory is a *vanishing span of time*.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The aid and comfort derived from the *remembrance* of *conflicts and suffering* that in former times have been *victoriously* endured in *faith*.—To *begin* in faith, but not to *endure*, leads to useless sacrifices, vain hopes, and fruitless sufferings.—The *attainment* of the promised blessings must be preceded by the *fulfilment* of the Divine will: but this cannot take place without a living *faith*, that proves itself in suffering.—The *proving* of one's faith in *one's own* and in *others'* sufferings.—A *manifold struggle of sufferings* is allotted to Christians in this world; but along with this, a *great promise*, and a rich *reward*.—How the *loss of earthly goods* is borne, and replaced by *more exalted and permanent possessions* in heaven.—Why *life* is not gained without *faith*.

Starke:—Christians are God's combatants, and must be in perpetual conflict; hence, they also expect the wreath of honor which the heavenly calling holds out to them.—What is to comfort us in all trouble and persecution? The hope of eternal blessedness in heaven.—Trouble and persecution are badges of the Christian; where they do not bear these in themselves, there is something wanting in their Christianity (2 Tim. iii. 12).—Christians are under obligation not merely to sympathize with the wretched, but, as far as possible, to help them.—Observe the characteristic of the kingdom, and of the members of the kingdom of Christ; which is to *do good* and to *suffer evil*. It is wonderful, but salutary; it must serve for great good (Ps. cix. 5).—In disease, pain, and suffering, confidence in our gracious God is better than all medicines; it is a tried means, and must bring aid.—Mark it, soul! it is not enough to have well begun the struggle; thou must also complete it, and arm thyself accordingly with patience. For he who falters, in him the Lord hath no pleasure; nay, he draws back to his condemnation.—A Christian must not by impatience make his cross heavier than it is, but in quiet and hope will be his strength, Jer. xxx. 15.—The suffering of the present time is brief and light, 2 Cor. iv. 17; Is. liv. 7; Ps. xxx. 6; we must not, therefore, allow the time under the cross to seem to us long.—The faith that brings salvation is no dead thing, but a living essence, and productive of life, Gal. ii. 20.—Ah! this should be our greatest care in the world, to save our soul, and all the more, that we are in imminent peril of losing it.

Rieger:—*Who* shall be the persons with whom we in our time hold and seek fellowship, is a point that must involve important consequences, reaching down to the day of Jesus Christ.—He who does the will of God, and awaits with patience the promise, has contentment on earth, and yonder, as the end of his faith, salvation.

Ahlfeld:—The righteous will live by faith. We consider: 1, the nature and quality of faith; 2, the righteous by faith; 3, the blessing of faith.

Heubner:—The longer we practice, the easier becomes the conflict.—There are secret trials, but also public sufferings; the latter are all the more bitter, inasmuch as they take place before the eyes of those who have no sympathy.—On moments hangs the blessedness of eternity.—The expectations of a faithful teacher are powerful stimulants; they inflame our zeal.

Hedinger:—Impatience destroys all the fruit of the Cross.

THIRD SECTION.

INSPIRITING RETROSPECT OF THE HISTORY OF THE BELIEVING ANCESTORS.

I.

Edifying examples of faith down to the time of Abraham.

Chapter XI. 1–7.

Now [But] faith is the substance of [confidence in] things hoped for, the evidence
2 [conviction] of things not seen. For by [in] it the elders obtained a good report.
3 Through faith we understand [apprehend intellectually, *νοοῦμεν*] that the worlds were
[have been] framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not
made of things which do appear [that not from the things which appear may
4 have sprung that which is seen[1]]. By faith Abel offered unto God a more excel-
lent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God[2] tes-
tifying of [over] his gifts; and by it he being dead yet [after dying still] speaketh.[3]
5 By faith Enoch was translated that he should [in order that he might] not see death;
and was not found, because God had [*om.* had] translated him; for before his [the[4]]
6 translation he had [hath had] this testimony, that he [has] pleased[5] God. But without
faith *it is* impossible to please *him:* for he that cometh to God must believe that he is,
7 and *that* he is [becometh] a rewarder of [to] them that diligently seek him. By faith
Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear [pious fore-
thought], prepared an ark to [for] the saving of his house; by the which he con-
demned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith.

[1] Ver. 3.—The reading *μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων* is now established, and the sing. *τὸ βλεπόμενον* deserves the preference before the plur. of the Rec. after Sin. A. D*. E*. 17.

[2] Ver. 3.—The reading *τῷ θεῷ* in A. D*. 17 received by Lachm. is evidently an error of the copyist. It is corrected in Sin.

[3] Ver. 4.—Instead of *λαλεῖται* read *λαλεῖ* after Sin. A. 17, 23, 31, 39.

[4] Ver. 5.—*Αὐτοῦ* of the Rec. after *μεταθέσεως* is, according to A. D*. 17, 67**, 80, to be expunged. In the Sin. it is added by a second hand.

[5] Ver. 5.—We are to write after Sin. A. K. L., 46, 71, 73, *εὐαρεστηκέναι*: on the other hand, after Sin. A. D. E., 109 *ηὐρίσκετο*.

[Ver. 1.—*ἔστιν δέ,—ἔστιν* not, as many, "there is faith," but: "but faith *is*," *etc.; ἔστιν* a copula, but, as very often in the classics, emphatically placed first,—*ὑπόστασις*, as occasionally in later Greek, *confidence*, as iii. 14. Not a *rhetorical description*, but a simple statement of the nature of faith.

Ver. 2.—*ἐμαρτυρήθησαν*, *were attested, received attestation.*

Ver. 3.—*νοοῦμεν* we perceive with the *νοῦς, mind, reason*, thus intellectually and rationally (Rom. i. 20)—*κατηρτίσθαι, have been (and so stand now) framed.* *Τοὺς αἰῶνας, the ages*, hence the worlds, regarded as existing in time.—*ῥήματι θεοῦ, by an uttered word, mandate of God* (i. 3).—*εἰς τὸ μή, in order that not*, the *logical* purpose of this intellectual perception: *μή* belongs to the whole clause, but grammatically to *γεγονέναι—ἐκ φαινομένων*, emphatically placed in the clause, thus: *in order that not out of things that appear—μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων* cannot stand for *ἐκ μὴ φαινομ.**—*μή—γεγονέναι, not—should have sprung*, as it would have done, unless discerned to have been framed by the word of God.

Ver. 4.—*Μαρτυροῦντος ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις, testifying over, on condition of*, his gifts: not *περὶ τῶν δώρων*—*ἀποθανὼν ἔτι, after dying, still, ἔτι, logical*, under this state of things, *viz.*, even after he was dead (see Gen. iv. 10).

Ver. 5.—*τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν, in order that he might not see*—experience death: the *purpose* of the translation, including perhaps also (Alf.) "the *purport*."—*πρὸ τῆς μεταθέσεως* previously to the translation—to the record of it, or to its occurrence as recorded.—*μεμαρτύρηται, he hath received testimony*, he stands attested to in the record.—*εὐαρεστηκέναι, to have pleased.*

Ver. 7.—*εὐλαβηθείς, moved with pious fear or foresight;* Alf., *taking forethought* (see *εὐλαβείας*, v. 7); *εἰς σωτηρίαν, for the saving.*—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1.—**But faith is confidence in things,** *etc.*—The position of *ἐστι* at the beginning of the clause by no means obliges us to the view last defended by Böhme, which was indicated by the Lect. Rec. up to the time of Griesb. by a comma after *πίστις*. According to this the following words would be *in apposition* with *πίστις*, while the real existence (*ἐστι=there is, there ex-*

*[I of course do not mean to deny the abstract possibility of this, nor to affirm that there are not Greek constructions very nearly or possibly quite analogous to it. I simply mean to say that there is here no such *necessity* as would alone justify our resorting to it; while again also *most* of the cases cited in proof of the usage are hardly satisfactory. Thus, in the passage of Thuc. i. 5, *ἡγουμένων ἀνδρῶν οὐ τῶν ἀδυνατωτάτων*, there is not the slightest necessity for assuming a transposition of the *οὐ*. "Men not the most powerless leading" is identical in meaning and equally natural with "men, *to wit*, those not most powerless."—K.].

ists) of faith would be asserted with emphasis, for which, however, there is no shadow of an occasion. Rather, the copula is made to precede (and hence as the subst. verb to be accented) in order to call attention to the predicates which characterize the subject (so also WIN. since Ed. 5). We are thus to look for a *definition* of faith, but a definition corresponding to the connection and object of the section: a definition therefore which does not restrict itself to mere Christian and Gospel faith, but presents religious faith in its broadest and most general aspects. The *object* of this faith is, therefore, in a manner entirely general, but still appropriately and exhaustively, designated as τὰ ἐλπιζόμενα and as πράγματα οὐ βλεπόμενα, designations which do not mutually cover each other, but are *concentric*, and express the essential relation of the objects of faith to the need and condition of the believing subjects, under both their practical and theoretical aspects. Ὑπόστασις and ἔλεγχος express that which, in this relation, faith is as an *affection or act of the mind.* The former denotes (com. ch. iii. 14) *steadfast confidence* (Luth., Grot., and most recent intppr); the latter, *conviction*, (particularly in the conscience) *assurance*, (August., Calv., Beng., *etc.*). The refutation of the rendering of ὑπόστασις as *substance* (ch. i. 8) as in Vulg., Ambros., August., Chrysos., Thom. Aqu., Schlicht., Beng., Bisp., *etc.*, or as *foundation*, as with Erasm., Calv., Stein, V. Gerl., *etc.*, or as *representation*, as with Castal., Paul., Menk.; and of ἔλεγχος, as *proof* with Vulg., or as *inward persuasion* with Bl., De W., Lün., Menk., will be found well worth reading in Thol. and Del. In proof of the correctness of his definition the author adduces the fact that ἐν ταύτῃ, *i. e.*, in point, or in respect of, a faith of such a nature, the ancient fathers have a good report. This meaning of μαρτυρεῖσθαι is frequent in Acts, and occurs, 3 John, 12; 1 Tim. v. 10. In this latter passage, as here, it is constructed with ἐν, which is neither to be regarded as equivalent to διά in vv. 4 and 39 (Luth., Calv., Grot., Beng., and others); nor need be separated from the verb=in possession of such a faith (Win., Bl., Lün.,), [Moll's construction is, I think, unobjectionable; there is no difficulty in making ἐν ταύτῃ directly limit the verb. They gained their attestation in this=in this point, in such a faith they gained a good report.—K.].

VER. 3. **By faith we understand.**—*νοοῦμεν*. We apprehend with the νοῦς, *mind*, intelligence. This verse would seem, according to Lün., to be out of place, and in relation to v. 4, to introduce an inharmonious element into the discussion. This unfavorable judgment springs from the erroneous supposition that v. 3 shows merely "the necessity of *faith*, on our part, in relation to a fact belonging to the past, and recorded in Scripture." To such a necessity the language has no reference; the passage treats merely of the fact that faith, as an assured conviction of things which are not seen, also evinces itself within us in our rational and spiritual perception of that *relation* of the creation to the Creator which forms the condition of all history, and all Revelation, while its more full unfolding belongs to the Scripture that commemorates the faith of the fathers.

This faith, resting upon and guided by the Holy Scripture, is the organ within us of that perception of the invisible in and above the visible, and of their reciprocal relation, to which neither the perceptions of sense, nor the deductions of reason of necessity lead. The most natural inference for men would rather be this, that τὸ βλεπόμενον, that which falls under the eye, that which meets our senses, has sprung ἐκ φαινομένων *viz.*, out of that which belongs to the world of phenomena. This idea of the *causal* relation of the phenomena to the τὸ βλεπόμενον must be set aside, as shown by the μὴ γενονέναι, which declares that the *seen* has not sprung from the *apparent.* The μή belongs (with all the best interpreters since Beza) to γεγονέναι, and not to ἐκ φαινομένων. With this latter, however, (=ἐκ μὴ φαιν.) it was constructed, after the Peshito, Vulg., Chrys., Theod., by the ancients generally, and recently by Stengel and Ebrard, and taken entirely arbitrarily as=*nothing*, *things non-existent*, while Schlicht., Este, and others, adopting the same construction, conjecture that the author, with his mind on Gen. i. 2, ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος of the Sept., refers to the visible issuing forth of the organized world from formless and blind chaos. With equal erroneousness most interpreters take the clause εἰς τὸ μή as denoting *result.* It, in fact, implies *purpose* (Hofm., Lün., Del., Riehm). It makes a recognition of the *design* of God in that framing and arrangement of the world (κατηρτίσθαι) which has been just before described. God, by the Word (ῥήματι), which gives authoritative expression to His will, has formed the αἰῶνας. These Æons (αἰῶνες) are (ch. i. 2) the invisible, spiritual, and permanent potencies of the phenomenal world, of which, at the opening of the epistle, the author has expressly said that they owe their origin to the Son of God, and of which he here says that they were formed, arranged, or put in order by the creative mandate of God. They form the antithesis required by Del., to the ἐκ φαινομένων, which antithesis he, supposing it not to be expressed, needlessly and erroneously supplies by ἐκ τῶν νοητῶν, as the intelligible and *divine ideas*, out of which the world has sprung. The entire confusion which has attended the explanation of this verse, has sprung from erroneously taking αἰῶνας, τὰ φαινόμενα and τό βλεπόμενον as equivalent designations of the world. Calvin unites the two words, writing ἐκφαινομένων as a single word, and takes τὰ βλεπόμενα as=κάτοπτρα, thus rendering "that they might become mirrors of invisible things." But the construction is harsh and unnatural. [I know no good authority, and no sufficient reason for Moll's singular explanation of αἰῶνες. The rendering *worlds*, either as material worlds (Del.), or as the aggregate of all things existing in time and space, seems far more natural, and meets all the necessary conditions of the passage. The antithesis to the τὰ φαινόμενα,—as that out of which the τὸ βλεπόμενον has really sprung,—is not the αἰῶνες as a set of spiritual and invisible potencies (as Moll), nor the τὰ νοητά, as, with fully equal improbability, supposed by Delitzsch, but simply the ῥῆμα θεοῦ, the sovereign mandate of God. Our sensible perceptions, is the author's idea, would lead us to regard all that we see as

having no deeper origin than the things which are palpable to sense, material and sensuous springing out of material; but faith enables us to trace all to the unseen but omnipotent agency of God.—K.].

VER. 4. **And by it he, being dead, yet speaketh.**—Many, following Chrys., take this language as declaring that the history of Abel contains still a sermon challenging our imitation of him, and that though dead, he still speaks in the testimony of Scripture. Philo finds in it a proof of the immortality of the righteous, and also Del. concludes from the cry of the blood of the righteous entering into the ear of God, that after his death he was still an object of divine care, and is thus an unforgotten, undestroyed, living personage. More correctly remarks Calv. with relation to Ps. cxvi. 15: *inde patet reputari inter Dei sanctos, quorum mors illi pretiosa est.* For the passage ch. xii. 24 shows that the author had in mind Gen. iv. 10, *to wit:* the crying of the blood of Abel to God for vengeance. God espoused the cause of Abel on account of his faith, and avenged his murder upon Cain (Riehm). The *λαλεῖ* is a historical present, and *ἔτι* stands not as *temporal*, but serves to bring out the contrast to *ἀποθανών*: with this latter word Œc. and Beng. erroneously connect *δι' αὐτῆς* which the former refers to *θυσία* as the occasion of his death, while the other supplies *πίστεως*, taking *διά* as=*ἐν* or *κατά*.

VER. 6. **For he who cometh to God.**—The rendering of Luth., Calov, Ramb., Wittich, Schultz, Ebr., "whoever would (or is to) come to God, as Enoch did," distorts the words of the text, *ὁ προσερχόμενος τῷ θεῷ*, which refer to drawing near to God in religious worship, ch. vii. 25; x. 1. So also *δεῖ* denotes here not so much moral obligation, as intrinsic necessity. It completes the proof that Enoch's translation was a *consequence* and reward of his faith.

VER. 7. **Moved with pious foresight.**—If *εὐλαβηθείς* meant "in the fear of God" Luth., a Lap., *etc.*), *τὸν θεόν* could scarcely have been omitted. Nor is the meaning of "pious trembling before the divine utterance" (Carpz., Böhme, De W., Hofm.), so appropriate as the reference to the *foresight* with which Noah, in faith in the received *χρηματισμὸς περὶ τῶν μηδέπω βλεπομένων*, proceeded to his preparations. To refer the words *δι' ἧς* to *σωτηρίαν* (Bald., *etc.*) is entirely inadmissible: we *may* refer them to *κιβωτόν* (Chrys., Calv., Bez., Grot., Bisp., *etc.*), while yet to refer them to the main subject of the discourse, *πίστει* (Primas., Thom. Aquin., Luth., Beng., *etc.*), is more in harmony with the connection. Noah is the first person in the Old Testament who received the epithet "righteous," Gen. vii. 9. It is further repeatedly applied to him, Ezek. xiv. 14, 20; Sir. xliv. 17; Wis. x. 4, 6; also 2 Pet. ii. 5 he is called a "preacher of righteousness."

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

Faith, by virtue of its nature as *faith*, excludes uncertainty and doubt, Matth. xiv. 31; xxi. 21; Rom. xiv. 23; James i. 6. On the contrary, it involves in principle the confidence of conviction, and the *firmness* of assurance. It is, however, for this reason also, an assurance of *itself*, Eph. iii. 12; not, indeed, as a formal strictly self-conscious certainty and reliableness of conviction, but as a conviction of the reality, truth, and saving power of its object. Such a conviction is, in its very nature, not an immediate perception, that excludes all formal argument, nor again a *logical* assumption, resting on satisfactory grounds of reason. It is a union of the soul with the object of faith, generated by moral and religious influences; and this object again is not, of course, something simply regarded as true, but it brings in the act of faith itself, the proof of its reality, and becomes a part of the living contents of the soul; while the soul is thus, in an undoubting and unwavering *certainty*, *assured* of the *hoped for* blessings, and has an *inward* conviction of the *invisible*.

2. It is this *characteristic of faith* which appears from the beginning as the invariable, indispensable, and unreplaceable *condition* for the attainment and maintenance of the *right relation* of men with God, and as such can be established by a series of *examples* from the Old Testament, which, on the one hand, furnish the *proof* of the assertion, and on the other, can, and should, serve as comforting and stimulating *examples* (Sir. xliv. 51).

3. That in and above the visible, invisible powers and agencies, work and hover, can be ascertained, even outside of the historical sphere of revelation. Nature and reason are so constituted, that the former exhibits herself as an aggregation of phenomena, and the latter is qualified to perceive the *noumena*, which reveal themselves in the phenomena, and can, hence, attain to the recognition of the existence of God, and to the beholding of his invisible attributes (Rom. i. 19, 20). But that the world is not a manifestation of the divine *essence*, not a shooting and breaking forth of divine thoughts, not the mere materializing of a divine ideal world, but that in its origin and arrangements, as well of that which is invisible, as of that which is visible, in and upon it, it must be regarded as a *work of the will of God*, who dwells in eternal self-consciousness, this can be known only on the ground of a *positive historical revelation.* The perception of this relation of the world to God, demands a faith analogous to faith in its other exhibitions.

4. Faith, however, has not to do merely with the Scripturally *announced fact* of the creation and appropriate arrangement of the world by the creating word; we also gain by faith the *understanding* of this fact, and especially that God's purpose in this fact is, to make God known as the creator of all things.

5. Those offerings which are *expressions of faith*, made not merely *to fulfil an obligation*, but as a result of profound internal conviction, best please God, and receive the testimony of their accordance with the divine will. But faith, as displayed in offerings, has special reference to the divine *compassion*, whether rendering thanks for benefits received, or yearning after more grace and fresh attestations of favor, or expressing the need of a restoring of that fellowship with God which sin has destroyed, and of representing the fellowship which grace has reëstablished.

6. God remembers *the pious* not merely after their death, so as to vindicate them and their

cause: He has also power to keep them before death, and to prove Himself not merely the avenger, but the *deliverer* of the believers. The deliverance is complete, when it effects their removal from earth to heaven.

7. Where there is religious approach to God, there at least exists faith in the *existence* of the invisible God, and faith in the *benefits of a diligent seeking of God.* This latter can plead great promises of God (Am. v. 4; Ps. lxix. 33), and by them faith, the condition of all divine approval, is strengthened and quickened.

8. Faith not only discerns *clearly*, by means of divine revelation, still future things, and is *certain* in respect to their coming, but also in virtue of its nature, involves *obedience* to the received word, and a full *yielding* to the arrangements which God has made, and the ordinances which He has enjoined. It is as far removed from an idle waiting for coming events, as from carnal security; and, therefore, while relying most implicitly upon the help of the Lord, fails in no degree in *thoughtful foresight* and *appropriate activity.*

9. Faith does not merely, by its *confession*, utter the judgment of the wicked world; but *faith itself* constitutes the *actual condemnation* of the world, which is hindered from using the existing means of deliverance only by its unbelief; while the believer, as a child of God, not only enters into the inheritance secured to him by pious ancestors, but into the *inheritance* of the *righteousness which God imparts*, and which, in all respects, *corresponds to faith.*

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Nature and *history* serve the *believer* for *advancement in faith* and for the *confirmation* of faith.—The faith of man determines not merely the *heart* of man, but also his *condition* and his *destiny.*—Faith in its *nature* and its *effects.*—The examples of faith: 1. what they *teach* us; 2. to what they *incite* us; 3. with what they *comfort* us.—God looks not merely at what we *do*, but also upon what we *intend.*—God not merely knows His own; He is also mindful of them, and enables them to recognize His *approval* of them.—God does not merely give Himself to be known; He would also be sought after, and enables every earnest seeker to find Him.—God renders help in time for *eternity*, yet only to those who make use of the *appointed means of aid.*—Faith has its *labor*, its *offering*, and its *burdens;* but it has also the approval of God, and the *inheritance of righteousness.*—*Drawing near* to God; 1. in its *blessing;* 2. in its *successive stages;* 3. in its *means.*

STARKE:—Away with the old and cold proverb; what our eyes see, that we believe (seeing is believing). Faith is trust and not sight.—Believers, as yet, possess not all; the most and the best they must still hope for.—Faith since it has in itself a Divine, persuasive, and convincing power, is as widely distinguished from credulity and illusive fancy as the day from the night, as a living hand from a painted one.—There is but one way to salvation, in the Old Testament as well as in the New, although this way in the New is much easier than in the Old.—Although faith is a spiritual gift of God, which has its seat in the heart, and is invisible, it still remains not unrecognizable; but along with its confession, reveals itself in works as its essential and inseparable fruits.—If a person pleases God by his faith, he pleases Him also by his works; but if, on account of unbelief, the person does not please Him, his works also fail to please Him, however holy they appear in the sight of men.—The remembrance of the righteous remains in blessing (Prov. x. 7; Matth. xxiii. 35).—Faith brings man into fellowship with God.—They who hasten after another, and seek not God, have from Him no reward of grace to comfort them.—The godly have, even in this life, material aid from their piety.

HAHN:—In every time faith has its proper exercises and objects.—Believers enjoy the happiness of the Divine testimony alike in their own conscience and in their relation to others.—Faith looks into the whole plan of creation alike in respect to the invisible and the visible.

HEUBNER:—An age without faith is despicable, valueless.—Just as much as man has of faith, so much is there in him of goodness.—All service of God is sanctified only by faith.—Faith in a God who is asleep, and concerns Himself not about the world, is no religion, and brings no happiness.

RIEGER:—The eyes of God look after faith, and, without faith, find nothing well pleasing in man.—The lack of sight must hinder none from steadfast adherence to God.

II.

The example of Abraham and Sarah.

CHAPTER XI. 8–12.

8 By faith Abraham, when[1] he was called to go out into a place which he should
after [was destined to] receive for an inheritance, obeyed [hearkened, ὑπήκουσεν]; and
9 he went out, not knowing whither he went [cometh]. By faith he sojourned in the

[a][2] land of promise, as *in* a strange [alien, ἀλλοτρίαν] country, dwelling in tabernacles
10 [tents] with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise: For he looked
for a [was looking for the] city which hath foundations, whose builder [architect, de-
11 signer, τεχνίτης] and maker [framer, fabricator, δημιουργός] *is* God. Through faith
also Sarah herself received strength to conceive seed, and was delivered of a child [*om.*
was delivered, *etc.*] when she was past age [contrary to her time of life],[3] because she
12 judged him faithful who had promised. Therefore sprang there even of one, and
him as good as dead [and that too, having become deadened], *so many* as the stars of
the sky in multitude, and as the sand[4] which is by the sea shore, [the] innumerable.

[1] Ver. 8.—Before καλούμενος, Lachm., after A. D. (E.?), puts the def. article, but omits it before τόπον, after A. D*., and writes with Tisch. after A. D*. K. ἔμελλεν, instead of ἤμελλε, as read, however, by Sin., which omits the art. before both καλ. and τόπ.

[2] Ver. 9.—The art. before γῆν is, according to Sin. A. D**. K. L. and many minusc., to be stricken out.

[3] Ver. 11.—Ἔτεκεν of the Rec., after ἡλικίας, is, according to A. D*., 17, to be expunged. In Sin. it is from the hand of the corrector.

[4] Ver. 12.—Instead of ὡσεὶ ἄμμος, we are to read after Sin. A. D. E. K. L., 23, 37, 46, 47, ὡς ἡ ἄμμος, and we retain the words ἡ παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος, which are wanting in D*. E. — Instead of ἐγεννήθησαν, write with A. E*. K., 109, 219*., ἐγενήθησαν.

[Ver. 8.—καλούμενος, *being called, summoned*; with Art. ὁ, as read by many, "he that is called Abraham;" but much less well.—ὑπήκουσεν ἐξελθεῖν, *hearkened, or obeyed. to go out*, i. e., *so as to go out.*—ἔμελλεν λαμβ., *was about, was destined to receive*; E. V., *should after receive.*—ποῦ ἔρχεται, *where, he cometh*, ποῦ, pregnant=*whither* (ποῖ), he is coming, and *where* he is going to remain.

Ver. 9.—παρῴκησεν εἰς γῆν, *sojourned, dwelt as a stranger* (lit., dwelt along side of) *in the land*; εἰς, again pregnant, "went *into* the land in order to sojourn *in* it." So Matth. ii. 23, κατῴκησεν εἰς πόλιν, *dwelt into*, *i. e.*, came *into* and dwelt *in.*—ὡς ἀλλοτρίαν, *as alien, as belonging to others*, though he had himself been promised the future possession of it.

Ver. 10.—ἐξεδέχετο, *he was awaiting, looking for*, Imperf.—τὴν πόλιν, *the city*, not, *a city*. τεχνίτης, *artisan, architect*; δημιουργός, *framer, builder*, *i. e.*, of the heavenly Jerusalem, xii. 22.

Ver. 11.—εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος, *for the depositing of seed* (Alf.); *for the founding of a seed*, an *offspring* (Moll); Del., *für befruchtenden Samen*; Stier, *einen Samen zu gründen*; De Wette, *zur Gründung des Geschlechts.*—καὶ παρὰ καιρὸν ἡλικίας, *even contrary to the period of her age or time of life* (παρά, *aside from, in inconsistency with*).

Ver. 12.—καὶ ταῦτα νενεκρωμένου, *and that too having become dead.*—καθώς, *according as*, equality of measure, not merely ὡς, *as*, of likeness.—ἡ ἀναρίθμητος, *the*=which is *innumerable*, agreeing with ἄμμος, not, as would seem in E. V., referring to the progeny.—K.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 8. **When he was called.**—The lect. rec. without the article is preferable in respect to sense, since ὁ καλούμενος Ἀβραάμ can hardly mean Abraham who was called or summoned, namely, to come forth (Lün.); but, in accordance with usage, could mean only the so-called Abraham, or, he who was called Abraham. But a reference to the change of name would here have nor elevancy, since this change took place not until twenty-five years after Abram's departure from Haran, the event which is here spoken of.

VER. 9. **Sojourned**—Παροικεῖν in the classics is used only of dwelling in the neighborhood, but in Hellenistic use, of sojourning as a foreigner; in connection with εἰς it includes also the idea of *coming* to sojourn.

VER. 10. **The city that hath foundations.**—This is not the earthly Jerusalem (Grot., *etc.*), but the heavenly (Gal. iv. 28), which (ch. xii. 22) is called the city of the living God, and (xiii. 14) the city that is to be, whose foundations also are mentioned (Rev. xxi. 14). In so far as God projected the plan of this city, He is called its τεχνίτης, and as the one who executes this plan, its δημιουργός. This latter word elsewhere only at 2 Macc. iv. 1. [It figures largely in the Gnostic vocabulary, but in a very different sense].

VER. 11. **Also Sarah herself.**—The emphatic καὶ αὐτή is referred by Chrys., Beng., *etc.*, to the fact that Sarah was a mere woman; by Schlicht., Schultz, *etc.*, to the fact that she was barren; but by the majority correctly to that of her having been at the outset unbelieving, Rom. iv. 19.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Faith gives to *obedience*, which is its *characteristic mark*, also *power*; for it surrenders man entirely into the hands of God, while he sacrifices his individual will with his natural propensities and dearest inclinations, and merges his heart entirely in the pleasure and will of God. The Divine *command* determines his *calling*, and in the *obedience* of faith he goes willingly whither God calls him; in the *confidence* of faith he leaves it entirely to the Divine disposal to determine time, place, object, and limit of his sojourning and his wandering; and in the *hope* of faith he confidently waits in his pilgrimage for the final fulfilment of the Divine promise, and anticipates his entrance into the eternal mansions.

2. Faith renders us not merely strong in the conflict with the trials of our earthly pilgrimage, and not merely willing to surrender our temporal possessions for eternal good; it conquers also *unbelief* and *doubt* in the bosom of man, and qualifies him to be an *instrument* of God's omnipotence and compassion, to which later generations are pointed for their edification and their admonition (Is. li. 1 ff.; Mal. ii. 15; Ezek. xxxiii. 24).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The *pilgrimage* of Abraham a *figure* of the character of *our earthly life.*—To the *believer* the word of *God* is sufficient: 1, as a *command* to set out; 2, as a *directory* of the way; 3, as *nourishment* on the journey.—The *leadings* of God are often

dark, and it is not unfrequently difficult for men to follow them; but faith which clings to God's *word* and *faithfulness*, receives *light* for the one, and *power* for the other.—Faith triumphs over *outward affliction* and over *inward assaults*.—It is not enough to have *received* a *call* from God: we must steadfastly *abide* in this clear to the end.—The *first* steps are frequently the hardest; but they are the *decisive* ones.—What we find in *God* repays abundantly what we *sacrifice in our vocation*.—As we have to *give heed* to the *word of God*, so we have to *trust* in the *power* of God.

STARKE:—The believer follows, if God calls him from one place to another, although he sees no temporal advantage, Acts xx. 22, 23.—Believers acknowledge that they are here strangers and pilgrims, and are seeking a genuine habitation.—The impotence of nature yields to the power of faith.—God fulfils abundantly His promises; blessed are all they who put their trust in Him!—Abundance of population is a Divine blessing, and produces no scarcity in the land; the fault of this lies in the sins of men (Lev. xxvi. 9, 26).

RIEGER:—The will of God is as an infinitely wide space which has indeed a narrow entrance; but whoever has once forced his way through the entrance, and has entirely offered up his will to God, he henceforth has abundant space in the will of God to move in accordance with His choice.—*Waiting* expresses exceedingly well the nature and power of faith. For in waiting, certainty of conviction springing from the promise, a loving longing and desire for the promised good, and patience in hope, flow together beautifully into one.—The word of promise is, to be sure, the only seed for faith; but to prepare the heart properly to preserve this seed often requires many other labors.

HEUBNER:—Faith produces perseverance under heavy trials.—Faith must, with the believer, decide in regard to the choice of his residence.—God gives to the dead new life.—God is the guardian of holy wedlock.

III.

Renewed glance at the Patriarchs, with special emphasis laid on the act of faith performed by Abraham.

CHAPTER XI. 13–19.

13 These all died in faith, [as] not having received the promises, but having seen them
afar off [from afar], and were persuaded of *them* [*om.* and were persuaded of *them*[1]],
and embraced [saluted, hailed] *them*, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims
14 on the earth. For they that say such things declare [show] plainly that they seek a
15 [their] country. And truly, if they had been mindful of [And if, indeed, they had
had in mind] that *country* [*om. country*] from whence they came out,[2] they might
16 [would] have had opportunity to have returned [to return]. But now [as it is], they
desire [are aspiring after] a better *country*, that is, a heavenly: wherefore God is not
17 ashamed to be called their God: for he hath [*om.* hath] prepared for them a city.
By faith Abraham, when he was tried [hath] offered up Isaac: and he that had re-
18 ceived [accepted] the promises offered up his only-begotten *son*, Of whom it was said,
19 That in Isaac shall thy seed be called: Accounting that God *was* [is] able[3] to raise
him [*om. him*] up,[4] even from the dead; from whence also he received him [back] in
a figure.

[1] Ver. 13.—The Rec. *καὶ πεισθέντες* is to be rejected by the unanimous testimony of MSS. except a few minusc.

[2] Ver. 15.—Instead of *ἐξῆλθον* read, with Sin. A. D*. E*., 17, 73, 80, *ἐξέβησαν*. In the Sin. *ἐξῆλθον* is added by the correct., as also *ἐμνημόνευον* instead of *μνημονεύουσιν*.

[3] Ver. 19.—Instead of *δυνατός* Lachm. reads *δύναται* after A. D**.

[4] Ver. 19.—The Rec. *ἐγείρειν* is sustained by Sin. D. E. K. L. and nearly all the minusc. The Reading *ἐγεῖραι* [Lachm.] by A., 17, 71.

[Ver. 13.—*Κατὰ πίστιν*, *in accordance with faith*, emphatic.—*μὴ λαβόντες*, *as not receiving*, stating the fact subjectively: *οὐ λαβ.* would state it objectively, simply as a fact.—*πόῤῥωθεν αὐτὰς ἰδόντες*, *from afar seeing and saluting them*, and thus dying, *κατὰ πίστιν*; *πόρ.* belongs equally to both Participles.—*ἀσπασάμενοι* beautifully of *saluting* in the distance one's native land or shore; not *embracing*.

Ver. 14.—*Ἐμφανίζουσι*, *make it plain, point out clearly*.—*πατρίδα*, not *χώρα*, *a region, territory*, but *a native land, an ancestral home*. German, *Vaterland*. Alf. renders "home." We might, perhaps, express it by the possessive Pron. "*their* country."—*ἐπιζητοῦσιν*, *are seeking after*.

Ver. 15.—*Καὶ εἰ μὲν ἐμνημόνευον—εἶχεν ἄν*, *and if, indeed, they had had in mind—they would have had*. Alf. remarks that the "two imperfects in this sentence present some little difficulty," as both events "are past and gone," while the customary construction of such imperfects is with the present time. But while the latter is, perhaps, the more frequent construction, the Imperfect, in this class of hypothetical propositions, is not unfrequently used equally of past times provided the action expressed be *habitual*. Thus Xen. says of Socrates, *οὐκ ἂν ἔλεγεν—ἐν μὴ ἐπίστευεν* which

rendered, "he would not be saying unless he believed," but which in the connection can only be rendered, "he would not have (habitually) said unless he had (habitually) believed." The construction is not uncommon enough to create any difficulty. Nor does it seem to me to involve "a harsh ellipsis" to understand ἐμνημόνευον, with Bl., De W., Del., Moll, *etc.* of *mentioning*, *meaning* in their utterances, rather than simply *to be mindful of*.—ἀνακάμψαι, *to return back*, *to return*.

Ver. 16.—νῦν δέ, *but as it is, as the case stands*.—ὀρέγονται, *they are reaching out after*, *are aspiring to*.

Ver. 17.—Προσενήνοχεν, *hath offered up*, *stands recorded as having offered up*, which he did virtually and in intention, "as if the work and its praise were yet enduring," Alf.—Προσέφερεν, *was offering up:* proceeding to greater detail, the author makes a more exact statement of the fact by exchanging the present for the past, and then employing not the Aor., which would have implied it as *done*, but the Imperf., which implies that it was only commenced, not carried through.—ὁ ἀναδεξάμενος, *he who had accepted*, not, *received*.

Ver. 18.—Πρὸς ὅν ἐλαλήθη, *In respect to whom it was said*. So I decidedly prefer to render with the Eng Ver. (*of whom*), referring the *whom* to Isaac, rather than with Moll, Alf., and most modern intpp., to render it *to whom*, and refer the *whom* to Abraham. That the πρός will equally well bear either rendering, needs no argument (see ch. i. 7, 8, 13); and the citation seems to me thus more thoroughly pertinent.

Ver. 19.—Ὅτι ἐκ νεκ. δυνατὸς ὁ θεός, *that God is* (not *was*) *able to raise*, *etc.*, a general statement (with Alf.).—For ὅθεν ἐκομίσατο see Exeg. notes.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 13.—Inasmuch as dying is not an effect of faith, but in the case of the Patriarchs took place in a way that bore the impress of faith, we have here κατὰ πίστιν, *in accordance with faith*, and not, as elsewhere, πίστει, *by faith*. And as the words are not οὐ, but μὴ λαβόντες, followed by a contrasted ἀλλά (Kühn., II. 408), the sense is not, as commonly supposed, "they died in faith, not in sight, inasmuch as they did not receive the blessings promised; and this dying in faith corresponded to their life in faith;" but the meaning is, as pointed out by Schultz, Win., and Lün., that their dying, occurring as it did, before the anticipated fulfilment of the promises, corresponded to the character of faith; just as already, even in life, their hope was fixed not on the earthly, but, in faith, on the heavenly father-land, and they, pilgrims, were journeying towards it. The whole clause stands in the closest connection, and the emphasis lies on the words introduced by ἀλλά. With this, too, best harmonizes not merely the reason assigned, v. 14 ff., for the patriarchal confession of v. 13, and for the author's interpretation of its import, but also the believing act (v. 17) of Abraham in his offering of Isaac. The reference to the 'promises,' commencing with Abr., and to the declarations of the Patriarchs, Gen. xxiii. 4; xlvii. 9, does not allow us, with Primas., Œc., *etc.*, to refer οὗτοι πάντες to all the previously named, from Abel down, Enoch, of course, being in this case excepted.

Ver. 15. **Had in mind.**—Μνημονεύειν is generally, as at ch. xiii. 7; Luke xvii. 32; Acts xx. 31, 35, taken intransitively=*be mindful of;* here, however, and v. 22, 1 Thess. i. 3, it is better taken by Bl., De W., Del., *etc.*, as *transitive*=*make mention of*, scil. in the declaration just referred to.

Ver. 19. **From whence he also received him back in a figure.**—In all other passages of our epistle ὅθεν, *whence*, is taken logically=*for which reason*. Thus it has generally been taken here, and ἐν παραβολῇ has been explained of Abraham's taking back Isaac as symbol and type, either of the resurrection generally (Bald., Mich., Böhm., *etc.*), or of the suffering and resurrection of Christ (Chrys., Prim., Erasm., Ebr., Bisp., *etc.*), or of both together (Theod.). Luther moreover erroneously renders ἐν παραβ., "zum Vorbilde," *for a type*, after the false reading of the *Vulg.* *in parabolam*. But so important typical references the author would scarcely have indicated to his readers in so incidental and obscure a manner, if he had had them in his mind. Yet it does not follow from this that we need depart from the customary meaning of παραβολή, *parable*, (found also in our epistle, ch. ix. 9), and, with Camerar., Krebs, Raphel., Loesn., go back to a rare signification of the verb παραβάλλεσθαι, *deliver up*, *expose*, *put to hazard*, and, with Thol., translate, "in bold venturing," or, with Lün., "for which reason he even on the ground, or by means of, his yielding him up, bore him off thence as a spoil." The term ἐκομίσατο can hardly be alleged in support of this meaning; for this word, though used, indeed, frequently of booty and spoils of conquest, is employed still more frequently of that which one previously possessed and has received back. Precisely in respect to Abraham and Isaac, Josephus (*Antt.* 1, 13, 4) employs this word, and Philo (II. 74, 4) makes use of it to designate the recovery of Joseph by his father. Ὅθεν easily admits of being taken *locally*, which meaning many able interpreters, following Calv., Bez., Schlicht., Grot., have assigned to it. We must not, however, render *by way of comparison*, or *in some measure*, or *so to speak*, but *in a likeness or figure;* and we must not, with Schultz and Steng., following Lambert Bos and Alberti, refer the language to the *birth* of Isaac, whom Abraham had obtained from himself, as νενεκρωμένον, but to the *saving of his life*. He received him from the dead in a figure in that Isaac resembled a person who had been put to death and re-awakened (Theodore Mops., Calv., *etc.*, more recently Bl., De W., Stier, Hofm., Del.). The explanation of Paulus, by virtue of a substitute, that is in exchange for the substituted ram, is unnatural; and unnatural, also, Bengel's supplying of ὤν with ἐν παραβολῇ, "*Abraham ipse factus parabola*." [Alford takes nearly the view of Paulus; "the true identification of the παραβολή is, I am persuaded, to be found in the figure under which Isaac was sacrificed, *viz.*, the ram, as already hinted by Chrysostom. Abraham virtually sacrificed his son; God designated Isaac for the burnt-offering, but provided a ram in his stead. Under the figure of that ram Isaac was slain, being received back by his father in his proper person, risen from the death which he had undergone ἐν παραβολῇ, in and under the figure of the ram. It is an obvious, though perhaps not fatal objection to this explanation that it applies ἐν παραβολῇ, *directly* to the death of the ram, and only indirectly to the restoration of Isaac, to which the author directly applies it. According to Alford's explanation, it would seem much more natural for the author to have said that Abraham sacrificed Isaac ἐν παραβολῇ, than that he received him back ἐν παραβολῇ.—K.].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. If believers know that the fulfilment of God's promises is still remote, nay, that they will never live to enjoy them personally upon the earth, this knowledge neither shakes their *confidence* nor troubles their *joy*. Time and space, uncertainty and doubt, disappear to the eye of faith. The *promised* blessings, faith views as the only *actual* and *true* ones, and rejoices in their future, indeed, but still certain *attainment*.

2. Even *death* changes nothing in this relation. The dying of believers bears in itself the *character* of *faith*, and on this is impressed most clearly the fact, that believers rejoice over their *entrance into the heavenly home*, which, during their earthly pilgrimage (Gen. xlvii. 9), they have known indeed, but only seen and saluted *from afar*.

3. There are also promises of God which refer to *temporal blessings* and *earthly goods*, whose fulfilment can be attained *here below*, as the increase of posterity, the inheriting of the promised land, victory over hostile nations. But believers have, from early times, regarded these promises and their fulfilment only as *parts* and *stages* of the one great promise of *salvation* which God has destined for His people; which the fathers waited for in faith (Gen. xlix. 18), and which is the essential link between the old and new Covenant.

4. The wandering of the patriarchs is not a mere restless roaming, or an aimless change of dwelling-places, but under *Divine guidance* is a *discipline* of obedience, a *proving* of faith, and a *type* and *example* for those who seek the abiding home; and for this reason they do not turn their eyes backward to the perishable world, and what they possess, gain, and lose therein; but forward to the promised and enduring good, whose *attainment* is certain, because God has *already prepared* it for them, and is no mere transitory good, but has come into a *permanent relation* to them, so that God is not ashamed to be called their God (Matt. xxii. 31 ff.).

5. During our pilgrimage to the heavenly home, *trials of our faith* do not cease, nay, they may even be heightened to *temptations*, if there seems to arise between the Divine *demands* and the Divine *promises*, and thus, in *God Himself*, an antagonism, a *contradiction*, which threatens also to divide and rend asunder the believer. The unity, however, remains preserved on both sides, and in all respects, if the believer on his side turns to nothing but the *express* and *clear* Word of God, and confidently leaves it with God, by virtue of *His omnipotence*, at all times to evince Himself as *the true and faithful One.*

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Strangers on earth, *at home* in heaven, hence called to a *pilgrimage*.—The *aspirations* of believers turn not backwards, but *forwards*.—What believers have experienced in *life*, turns to their benefit in *death*.—The *latest* trials are not always easiest, but along with *experience* faith has also increased in power.—God *acknowledges* those who *acknowledge* Him, and leads them to *the enduring city* which they are seeking.—He who in the obedience of faith can *give* to God what God demands, in him the *promises* of God will find overwhelmingly their *fulfilment*.

STARKE:—They who acknowledge that their citizenship is in heaven (Phil. iii. 20) will easily forget what is behind, and press forward to that which is before (Phil. iii. 13).—He who has once escaped from the vanity of the world must not allow himself again to be entangled therein; even to look back is dangerous (Luke ix. 62; xvii. 32).—Where faith is there is also obedience to God.—God takes the will of man, where outward hinderances prevent the execution, for the accomplished deed.—God has free power to bless and exalt one child of a father above another. — Faith must be simple that it may not too nicely quibble and dispute over things that appear unreasonable and impossible, and may assure itself that nothing is lost of all that is offered to God (Matt. xvi. 25).—Faith must cling to the truth and omnipotence of God.

RIEGER:—Unbelief easily vexes itself in regard to death, as in regard to all the earlier humiliations of the cross; faith adheres to the word, and with this passes, as through all preceding struggles, so also through the humiliation of death.—Faith, through the word, brings near to itself the promised good, approves the entire arrangement of God in this respect, and is not vexed and discouraged by delay.—From the tranquillity of faith springs the willing confession that one is a stranger; but that in all his action and suffering he is led on by the hope of reaching his fatherland.—In faith we learn to reconcile things which seem directly hostile to each other, as "dying and behold we live."—The obedience of Abraham springs not from a capricious self-persuasion, or from the power of a heated imagination; it is the fruit of a reflection and a mature judgment, which comprehends and sums up all good *in the ways of God*.

HAHN:—The extent of our self-denial bears witness how deeply the sense of heavenly things has its lodgment in the heart.

HEUBNER:—Never has the pious man completely realized on earth the longing of his heart; he is always hoping for something better. —The crown of all hopes is the city of God, where God in the most glorious manner will dwell among His saints.—Faith makes us strong to offer up that which is dearest to us.

IV.

The example of Isaac, Jacob and Joseph.

CHAPTER XI. 20–22.

20 By faith [also] Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau concerning things to come. By faith
21 Jacob, when he was a dying [while when dying], blessed both [each of] the sons of
22 Joseph; and worshipped, *leaning* upon the top of his staff. By faith Joseph, when
he died [while dying], made mention of the departing of the children of Israel; and
gave commandment concerning his bones.

[1] Ver. 20.—Read after A. D*., 17, 23, 37, Vulg. It., *πίστει καὶ περὶ τῶν μελλόντων.*

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 20. **Also.**—The position of *καί* forbids our regarding the present as the mere appending of a new example of faith from the history of the Patriarchs. *Either* faith is here designated as of a nature which displays its inward confidence by the utterance of a blessing, and this in relation to a thing in the future; in which case the act of blessing evinces an undoubting faith that the word will be followed by the actual fulfilment (Theodoret, Lün.); *or* the *καί*, with its emphasizing force, introduces the blessing as an act of faith that even *determines* the future (Del.). In both cases *περὶ μελλ.* is dependent on *εὐλογ.* To connect it with *πίστει* (Peshito, Sykes) would yield a construction elsewhere without example in the New Testament, and opposed to the *absolute* use of *πίστει* elsewhere throughout the chapter.

VER. 21. **Worshipped, leaning,** *etc.*—In the Heb. text (Gen. xlvii. 31) it is said, "he bowed himself upon the head of his couch" (Knobel), or, "he turned himself about upon his bed, turning his face to its head" (Hofm., Del.). At all events, he rendered thanks to God *in this way*, as the aged David did in a similar case, 1 Kings i. 47; while in his discourse with Joseph he had sat upright on his bed. In his weakness, he could neither arise nor prostrate himself. Our author here as elsewhere follows the Sept. with their pointing, הַמַּטֶּה instead of הַמִּטָּה; and has perhaps designedly brought this passage into connection with the act of blessing recounted Gen. xlviii., in order to express the devout frame of mind in which this blessing was uttered (Thol.). Perhaps, too, we are to take *αὐτοῦ* in the sense of the reflexive *αὑτοῦ*, and to refer the term to the pilgrim-staff of Jacob, Gen. xxxii. 10. The reference of this pronoun to Joseph, as well as the supplying of *τῷ Ἰωσήφ* with *προσεκύνησεν* (Chrys., Theodor., Theoph., *etc.*) is discountenanced by the utter absence of any mention of a staff of honor belonging to Joseph (which indeed Thom. Aqu. regards as symbolical of the cross of Christ, and Joseph as type of the Messiah), as well as by the connection of the passage, which points to no marks of homage which Jacob, in fulfilment of Joseph's dream, may at last have rendered to him. But the rendering of the Vulg. *et adoravit fastigium virgæ ejus*, followed by Primas., Œc., Erasm., Calv., Bisp., Reuss, *etc.*, who regard it as indicating the *direction* of his homage, and as acknowledging in act the future greatness of Ephraim, is grammatically inadmissible; for *ἐπί τι* nowhere occurs as expressing the object of *προσκυνεῖν*.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Believers care in the best way not only for their *own future*, but also for that of their *children and remote posterity*. Therefore they *bless* them, and God hears their *prayer*.

2. The *blessings* pronounced by believers are not mere utterances of pious wishes, but *prophecies* of the future, and *actions* which exercise a *determining* power upon history. Yet they are not sorcerers' utterances which could exercise a mastery over the will of God, and magically determine the fate of other men. They originate and exert their influence only on the ground and in the power of a human will *brought into contact with the will of God. It is God Himself who fills and guides the blessing, heart, hand and lips.*

3. Faith strengthens and influences even the weak and dying, so that they look only to God's promises, wait in blessing and in prayer clear to the end, desire, after their decease, to be gathered to their fathers and brought into the land of promise, and direct toward this all their arrangements.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

They *who die in faith* think: 1, of the *promises* which they have inherited; 2, of the *prayers* with which they are to finish their course; 3, of the *benedictions* with which they can influence their posterity.—Faith renders men: 1, equally *potent in life* and *joyful in death*; 2, equally *bold and humble*; 3, equally *reflective and forecasting*.—The *best kind of concern* for our *posterity*.

STARKE:—As the Patriarchs with great industry transmitted the *promises* of Christ to their posterity, so should we be zealous to bring the *Gospel* of Christ to posterity.—The saints frequently do, under the direction and guidance of God, something in which they indeed have a good purpose, but in respect to which God has determined something still higher.—It matters little at the present time where we are buried, provided only that the soul comes into Abraham's bosom; for the earth is every where the Lord's. Ps. xxiv. 1.

RIEGER:—By the early setting in order of his house, Jacob admonishes us of his daily dying, and of the renewed confession of his earthly pilgrimage.

HEUBNER:—Even in age, and amidst the great infirmities of age, Jacob was strong in his faith in the sure purpose and counsel of God.—The desire of Joseph to have his bones buried with his forefathers, indicates faith in a perpetual communion among believers through the power of God.

V.

The example of Moses.

CHAPTER XI. 23–29.

23 By faith Moses, when he was born, was hid three months of [by] his parents, be-
cause they saw *he was* a proper child [that the child was beautiful]; and they were
24 not afraid of the king's commandment. By faith Moses, when he was come to years,
25 refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; Choosing rather to suffer affliction
with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season [to have a
26 transient enjoyment from sin]; Esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches
than the treasures in Egypt;[1] for he had respect [for he was looking away] unto the
27 recompense of the reward. By faith he forsook Egypt, not fearing the wrath of the
28 king; for he endured as seeing him who is invisible. Through faith he kept [he has
celebrated] the Passover, and the sprinkling of blood, lest [in order that] he that de-
29 stroyed[2] the first-born should [may not] touch them. By faith they passed through
the Red Sea, as by dry *land*;[3] which the Egyptians assaying to do, were drowned.

[1] Ver. 26.—Instead of τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ read after Sin. D. K. L., 31, 44, 46, τῶν Αἰγύπτου.

[2] Ver. 28.—The more correct orthography is ὀλεθρεύων after A. D. E., instead of ὀλοθρεύων.

[3] Ver. 29.—After ξηρᾶς we are to add γῆς after Sin. A. D*. E., 17, 31, 47.

[Ver. 23.—γεννηθείς, *on being born—when he was born.*—εἶδον ἀστεῖον τὸ παιδίον, *they saw the child* (*to be*) *fair; comely*; ἀστεῖον, predicate.

Ver. 24.—μέγας γενόμενος, *on becoming large, on being grown up.*—θυγατρὸς, *of a daughter*, without the Art.

Ver. 25.—πρόσκαιρον ἁμαρτίας ἀπόλαυσιν, *a temporary enjoyment from sin*; ἁμαρτίας being here not the Gen. object., denoting sin as that which is enjoyed, but Gen. subject., denoting sin as conferring the enjoyment, or that *from* which the enjoyment comes. Here, as at ch. iii., the sin of *apostasy*. So Bl., Del., and Moll. Alf. denies, and makes it the Gen. obj.; but unnecessarily, and with much less force in the train of thought of the Epistle.

Ver. 26.—ἀπέβλεπεν, *he was looking away*, as ἀφορῶντες, "so as to be waiting for it, or by regard for it determined or strengthened in a course of action" (Bl.), xii. 2.—μισθαποδοσίαν, *the rendering of the reward* (ii. 2).

Ver. 27.—κατέλιπεν (κατά, intensive), *abandoned, forsook.*—τὸν ἀόρατον—ὁρῶν, *seeing the unseen*, scil., perhaps βασιλέα; a paronomasia, as Rom. i. 20, τὰ ἀόρατα—καθορᾶται.

Ver. 28.—Πεποίηκεν, *he has made*; either *instituted*, or, in conformity with the common use of the word in such connections, *celebrated*. The Perf. indicates it as a thing *standing recorded in history as done* (ver. 17, προσενήνοχεν).—τὴν πρόσχυσιν, not strictly the *sprinkling*, but the *pouring* on (*Angiessung*) of blood.

Ver. 29.—ἧς πεῖραν λαβόντες, *of which*, scil., either γῆς or θαλάσσης. The former preferred by Kuin., Böhm., Klee, Del.; the latter by Bl., Lün., Alf. Moll does not decide, but apparently inclines to γῆς.—κατεπόθησαν, *were drunk up, swallowed up, drowned.*—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 23. Inasmuch as οἱ πατέρες in Greek sometimes has the same signification as οἱ γονεῖς (examples in Wets. and Del.), and the mother of Moses is expressly mentioned in the original, we must refer the term to Jochebed and Amram, and not (with Beng., Menk., Stier, and others,) put in place of the mother of Moses, her father, Kohath.

VER. 24. **Come to years** (become large) μέγας γενόμενος.—Schultz and Bretschn. refer the μέγας to worldly power and honor; but the contrast is between the child and the grown up man, who has reached the period of independent choice and decision.

VER. 25. **To have enjoyment from sin.**—The ἁμαρτίας ἀπόλαυσις is not *the enjoyment of* sin (Theoph. Schlicht, Lün., Alf., *etc.*), but the enjoyment to which sin opens the way; for this enjoyment, indicated as for a season, stands in

the same relation to apostasy from God and from His people (as that ἁμαρτία which we are to shun mentioned, ch. iii. 13; x. 26), as the suffering of affliction bears to fellowship with the covenant people of God.

Ver. 26. **The reproach of Christ.**—Lün. understands by the ὀνειδισμὸς τοῦ χριστοῦ, the reproach which Christ bore; Ebr. (after the elder interpp.), the reproach for the sake of Christ which Moses endured by virtue of his hope in the Messiah; Bl., Del., and others, correctly, the reproach which Christ had to endure in His own person, and has to endure in His members. The author's warrant for ascribing to Moses a participation in this reproach is found by Hofm. in the typical connection, by virtue of which, the Old Testament people of God bear in themselves the impress of Christ, inasmuch as Christ is He whom the Old Testament history, in advance, represents, and whom the Old Testament Word promises. Stier finds this warrant in the mystical unity of Christ and His church; De W. and Thol., in the pre-existent presence of Christ as the Logos, in the Old Testament Israel (1 Cor. x. 4; 1 Pet. i. 10 ff.); Baumg., (*Theol. comm. on the Pent.*) citing the authority of Augustine, in that preparation for Christ's appearance in the flesh which runs through the entire history of Israel. Delitzsch unites the various explanations, and says: "The reproach of Christ is, to our author, the reproach of the Christ who was present as Logos in His people made one with Him, and there typically announcing His incarnation which was yet to take place."

Ver. 27. **Forsook Egypt.**—All the Greek and Latin intpp., except Nich. Lyra, refer this to the flight of Moses to Midian, Ex. ii. 15; but since, in that case, the flight was occasioned by fear of the king's wrath (v. 14), but here, on the contrary, is ascribed to Moses' fearlessness, very weighty interpreters since Lyra (as Calv., Schlicht., Grot., Calov, Böhme, Bl., *etc.*, and recently Ebr. and Bisp.) have referred it to the Exodus of Moses with the collected people. Justly, however, Zeger, Calmet, Bengel, De Wette, Tholuck, Lünemann, Delitzsch, and others, have adhered to the earlier view. In favor of this is the succession of events here recounted; the expression κατέλιπεν, *abandoned, forsook*, which, indeed, might possibly be referred to the Exodus, (Joseph., *Antt.*, II. 15, 2), but in the present connection points to something personally, and exclusively pertaining to Moses; and finally, the circumstance that the Exodus (Ex. xii. 31) took place with the consent of Pharaoh. Nor is it necessary to the solution of the above mentioned contradiction, to assume, with De Wette, a decided failure of memory on the part of the author, or, with Lün., to distinguish a fear, taken objectively, from fearlessness as a purely subjective emotion. We might ask, with Tholuck, could not the author, without forgetting the fear inspired in Moses by the first rumor of the king's wrath, wish to express that his faith had nevertheless overcome that fear? or we can say, with Del., that he, the son of Pharaoh's daughter, quitted Egypt without consulting the king; that he did this without fearing the heightened wrath which he incurred by this voluntary sundering of his relation to the Egyptian court. Both interpreters appeal in support of their view to the reason stated in the following clause, "he endured, *etc.*"—[It seems to me that this is a case in which it is equally gratuitous to suppose, with De Wette, a failure in the author's memory; and, with Alford and others, to feel any serious difficulty in the explanation. Looking at the withdrawal of Moses from Egypt, it seems to me that one might, with nearly equal truth, say that he left "fearing," or, "*not* fearing" the wrath of the king; and that which one would be likely to say would depend simply on his point of view and immediate purpose in recurring to the event. That, in his earlier withdrawal, Moses *did* fear the wrath of the king is certain, and this was the immediate occasion of his *flight* as such. But, on the other hand, that his entire course at this time, alike in the act which occasioned his flight, and his general choice and state of mind, arose *above* considerations of fear, and were determined by *a practical defiance* of the wrath of the king, is equally certain. According, therefore, as the writer had his mind on the one or the other of these facts, the passing fear that dictated the flight, or the higher courage and trust in God which prevented that fear from being controlling, and which, in fact, led him to *provoke* the wrath of the king, he might use one representation or the other. Here it better suits his purpose to present the spiritual fearlessness which dictated his whole course of conduct, in connection with its ground, *viz:* his faith in Him who is *unseen*. I think that βασιλέα is to be understood with τὸν ἀόρατον. The author puts the unseen heavenly King, whom Moses saw with the vision of his faith, over against the seen king, at whom, without this vision, he would have trembled.—K.].

He endured.—It is grammatically unallowable to make (with Luth., Beng., Schultz, Paul., Ebr.) τὸν ἀόρατον dependent on ἐκαρτέρησεν. For the transitive signification of this verb is not to *adhere* to something, but to *endure* something, *e.g.:* hunger and thirst. Here the intransitive signification alone is possible.

Ver. 28. **Hath celebrated the Passover.**—Since ποιεῖν uniformly appears along with φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα, only of the celebration of the Passover (Ex. ix.; Ex. xii. 48; Num. ix. 2; Josh. v. 10; Matt. xxvi. 18), the assumption that here the significations of founding and celebrating are united (Böhm., Bl., Lün.), is not merely uncertain (De W.), but false: "yet the perfect πεποίηκεν may suggest the idea that the Egyptian passover, which stands before us as an accomplished fact, has become the foundation for the celebration of the Passover in subsequent times" (Del.).

Destroyer, *etc.*—The Heb. הַמַּשְׁחִית =*destruction*, the Sept. translates by ὁ ὀλεθρεύων, and certainly (as Asaph, Ps. lxxviii., 49) conceives as an angelic minister of divine justice (comp. 1 Chron. xxi. 12, 15; 2 Chron. xxxii. 21; Sir. xlviii. 21; 1 Cor. x. 10). It is grammatically impossible to connect τὰ πρωτότοκα with θίγῃ (Klee, Paul., Ebr.). This verb governs the Gen. (here αὐτῶν and τὰ πρωτότοκα is dependent on ὁ ὀλεθρεύων. Of course, in the connection "*their* first-born," is readily understood to refer

to the first-born of the Israelites, though the latter are not expressly named.

Ver. 29. **Of which the Egyptians making trial.**—The relative ἧς can be equally well referred to the "dry land" immediately preceding (Böhm., Kuin., Klee, Del.), or to the "Red Sea." Πεῖράν τινος λαμβάνειν may mean *to make trial* of something, or, to make an *attempt* at something, as here and v. 36.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. When we believe that God has special purposes regarding a man, we not merely *hope* for his *preservation*, but we acquire *courage* in coöperating for his deliverance; and we rely on God's assistance in deeds of daring, and amidst circumstances of peril.

2. Worldly greatness, honor, power, and pleasure, have, indeed, a *splendid appearance*, and exercise a *power of temptation* by which many *are led astray;* but the believer recognizes the perishable and dangerous character of these possessions and enjoyments. He looks to the *future*, the divine *judgment*, and the *recompense* of *reward;* and allows himself to be influenced neither by the *allurements* nor by the threats of the world; is seduced neither by the fear nor the favor of man, but remains steadfast in his vocation, having God *before his eyes* and *in his heart*.

3. The power to *deliver* and to *destroy*, lies not in outward things and events, but, on the one hand, in the *favor* and in the *wrath* of God, who employs them as means and instruments; on the other, in the *faith* and the *unbelief* of men, who use these means for *salvation*, or abuse them to their *ruin*.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Faith looks to the *purposes* of God regarding the children of men, and to the *means* of their accomplishment.—The believer fears neither to encounter the *wrath of men*, nor to endure the *reproach of Christ*.—That which brings *salvation* to the believer, brings the unbeliever to *destruction*.—The believer looks, 1, not upon the *outward appearance*, but upon the *inward form;* 2, not upon *perishable riches*, but upon the *eternal possessions;* 3, not upon the *visible world*, but upon the *invisible God*.

Starke:—The world abuses in many ways the outward form and condition of men; but God frequently employs them as a means or occasion for great good. To many a one they serve as a means of trial.—Governments are in God's stead, and are to be honored; but when they give ungodly commands, these are to be given to the winds, Acts v. 29.—The friendship of God and the world cannot be enjoyed together (Jas. iv. 4).—The temporal afflictions of the pious are followed by eternal joy; the temporal joy of the ungodly by eternal affliction; consider well to which thou wilt devote thyself.—In sufferings and afflictions we must look to the gracious reward in heaven; this can alleviate and sweeten all (Ps. xciv. 19).—To be despised and persecuted for Christ's sake, is an honor and a token of our attaining to the heavenly glory (Matth. v. 11, 12).—Let the enemy continue to rage; he cannot overpass the limits which God has fixed. When God chooses to bear with him no longer, He strikes him to the ground (Isa. xli. 10; xliii. 16, 17; li. 9, 10).

Rieger:—O how many of our natural impulses lack that right direction which faith would give to them! how often do we yield ourselves and our children to the disposal of men, and faith should strengthen us to yield them up at the good pleasure of God!—Faith frequently receives guidance and direction from the visible; but it transforms the visible not into food for vanity, but into nourishment for its trust.—One may, even out of the delicate and beautiful, weave subtle snares for his own children, and for the innocence of others.—Faith and foolhardiness are widely separated from each other.—Faith admits the judicious employment of all means of security.

Heubner:—Fellowship with the people of God leads to suffering, but apostasy brings after temporal gain eternal shame.—Faith is the spiritual eye which recognizes the nothingness of earthly treasures, and the value of the heavenly.—Faith at once *foregoes* and *preserves*.

Burckhardt (Ohly, 1862, II. 2):—The believing spirit of the Christian: 1. In its nature; it regards the reproach of Christ, spurned and contemned Christianity, more highly than, *a*, earthly life, ver. 23; *b*, worldly honor, ver. 24; *c*, sinful pleasure, ver. 25; *d*, temporal riches, ver. 26. 2. In its reward: *a*, it brings out of Egypt, the house of bondage of sin, ver. 27; *b*, secures against temporal death by the blood of Christ, ver. 28; *c*, goes confidently through death into the heavenly Canaan, ver. 29.

VI.

Examples from the conquest of Canaan to the time of the Maccabees.

Chapter XI. 30–40.

30 By faith the walls of Jericho fell down,[1] after they were compassed about [for] seven
31 days. By faith the harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not [diso-
32 beyed], when she had received [after receiving] the spies with peace. And what

shall I more say [what do I say further]? for the time would [will] fail me to tell
[while recounting, διηγούμενον] of Gideon, and *of* Barak, and *of* Samson, and *of* Jeph-
thah [of Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah];[2] *of* David also, and [both of David and]
33 Samuel, and *of* the prophets: Who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought right-
34 eousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, Quenched the violence of
fire, escaped the edge of the sword,[3] out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant
in fight [became mighty in war], turned to flight the armies of the aliens [foreigners].
35 Women received their dead raised to life again [*or* from a resurrection, ἐξ ἀναστάσεως]:
and others were tortured [on the rack], not accepting deliverance, that they might
36 obtain a better resurrection. And others had trial of *cruel* mockings and scourgings,
37 yea, moreover [and still further] of bonds and imprisonment: They were stoned, they
were sawn asunder, were tempted [or were burnt][4], were slain with the sword: they
wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented
38 [outraged]; Of whom the world was not worthy: they wandered [wandering] in[5]
39 deserts and *in* mountains, and *in* dens and caves [caves and holes] of the earth. And
these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise:[6]
40 God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should [might]
not be made perfect.

[1] Ver. 30.—*ἔπεσαν* is to be read, after Sin. A. D*., 17, 23, 31, instead of *ἔπεσε*.

[2] [Ver. 32.—Moll follows Tisch. and Lachm. in omitting the *καί* connecting Gideon, Barak, *etc.*, reading Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah.—K.].

[3] Ver. 34.—Instead of *μαχαίρας*, Lachm. and Tisch., ed. 7, read *μαχαίρης* after A. D., as in ver. 37 after D*. In both cases the reading is supported by Sin. So also the reading *ἐδυναμώθησαν*, received by Lachm and Tisch. instead of the Rec. *ἐνεδυν* which in Sin. is only from a second hand.

[4] Ver. 37.—Instead of *ἐπειράσθησαν—tentati sunt* (Vulg. Ambros.), Luth. reads 1530, *ἐπάρθησαν*, *were pierced through*. The majority, following Erasmus, conjecture, inasmuch as *πειρᾶν* cannot be made—*torture*, an old error of the copyist, and introduce a word indicating death by *fire*, best *ἐπρήσθησαν*. In the Sin. this word follows the one given above [rather in Sin. the word is *ἐπρίσθησαν*].

[5] Ver. 38.—The reading *ἐν ἐρημίαις* of Sin. A., 71, 73, 118, received by Lachm. and Tisch., ed. VII., appears to be an error of the copyist. The Rec. *ἐν ἐρημ.* is sustained by D. E. K. L.

[6] Ver. 39.—Lachm. reads the plur., *τὰς ἐπαγγελίας*, after A. 80.

[Ver. 30.—*ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας*, *for seven days*.

Ver. 31.—*τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν*, *with them that disobeyed*, not *ἀπιστήσασιν*, *disbelieved*.

Ver. 32.—*τί ἔτι λέγω*, *what do I say further*, *διηγούμενον*, *recounting narration*.

Ver. 34.—*ἐγενήθησαν ἰσχυροὶ ἐν πολέμῳ*, *became mighty in war*.—*ἀλλοτρίων*, *belonging to other lands, foreigners*.

Ver. 35.—*ἐξ ἀναστάσεως*, *from* or *out of a resurrection*.—K].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 30. **For seven days.**—Ἐπί, of *duration of time*, as Luke iv. 25; Acts xiii. 31; xix. 10. Πίστει is not to be connected with κυκλωθέντα (Grot.), and this latter does not mean *beleaguered* (Schultz and others).

Harlot.—Jac. Cappell. and others, following the Chaldee paraphrase, erroneously translate ἡ πόρνη, *the hostess*; others, with Braun, explain the word, *the idolatress*. It is taken from the history, Josh. ii. 2; vi. 17 ff. Her faith consisted in her strong practical confidence (Jas. ii. 25) in the victory of the Israelites, because their God was the omnipotent God (Josh. ii. 9). His miracles had not remained unknown also to the remaining inhabitants of Jericho (Josh. ii. 10), but they, making but small account of these, attempted to withstand the people of God (Josh. vi. 1).

Ver. 32. **Gideon**, *etc.*—The order of succession is not chronological. But the author does not design such an enumeration, and he has scarcely had in mind any particular mode of grouping. Del., indeed, assumes three groups, of which the two first consisted of three persons each, and thinks that the author in the first group names Gideon as the greater hero of faith, before Barak, and in the second names Samuel after David, that he may attach to him the third group, *viz.*, that of the prophets. But what authorizes such a triple division? And what purpose would suggest the introduction of Jephthah, who besides is placed after Samson, into the second group? Rather according to *lect. rec.*, followed by Del., only Barak and Samson are more closely united by τε καί, as also David and Samuel, while between Gideon and Barak there is no connective particle. In like manner there is none between Jephthah and David, but before Jephthah, as before the prophets, is placed the simple καί. Lün. starts from the fact that David and Samuel are in all the MSS. connected by τε καί, and concludes from this that the preceding names were originally arranged in pairs. In that case the chronological objection would disappear, inasmuch as each new pair makes a new stage of historical progress, while in the successive pairs, the naming of the later before the earlier, is justified on rhetorical grounds, as bringing together the names of those who were coincident in time. But this ingenious conjecture rests on a combination of different readings, retaining the Rec. under the two modifications of placing (with D*.) καί before Barak, and (with A., 17, Vulg., Copt., Arm., and many Fathers) striking out τε καί before Samson. The καί before Jephthah is rejected, although found in D. E. K. L., nearly all the minusc., Chrys., Theodoret, Damasc., *etc.* Lachm. and Tisch., are consistent in striking out all the particles except the unquestionable τε καί before, and καί after Samuel This has also the authority of Sin.

Ver. 33. **Who subdued kingdoms.**—The οἱ, *who*, refers not to the *prophets*, but to all the

previously named persons, who, however, are merely adduced as examples, so that we are not to ask, in each individual one of the following statements, what person the author had specially in view. Many of the deeds and sufferings belong to persons who are not even particularly cited, but point us in general to the historical books of the Old Testament, from which the persons named are selected by way of example. The meaning, "obtain by conflict" (Böhme), can scarcely be established for *καταγωνίζεσθαι* [rather *contending down, wrestling down=subduing.*—K.].

Wrought righteousness.—Ἐργαζ. δικ. is hardly used in the purely ethical sense (Theodoret, Erasm., Schlicht., Grot., *etc.*), but refers to the acts and influence connected with the office of Judges, Kings and Prophets, 1 Sam. xii. 4; 2 Sam. viii. 15; 1 Chron. xv. 14; 2 Chron. ix. 8.

Obtained promises. — Beng., Bl., Ebr., *etc.*, follow Chrys., Primas., Theodoret, in understanding God's words of promise, and this not mainly His individual, but His Messianic promises. But the common reference of the words to the *substance* of the promises, better suits the connection; for if the believers failed to live to witness the promised salvation, ver. 39, yet they at least realized the fulfilment of special assurances. The plur. employed without the article, favors this view.

Stopped the mouths of lions, *etc.*—We might refer this to Samson and David, but the language points rather to Daniel, vi. 18–23; as also the following example (by force of faith quenched the force of fire) is drawn from Daniel iii., or 1 Maccabees ii. 59. Perhaps the following examples point also to events belonging to the times of the Maccabees, although they have their parallel in the earlier period, *e. g.*, 1 Kings xix.; 2 Kings vi. and xx.; Jud. xvi. 28; Ps. xviii. 30. The word *παρεμβολή*, signifying not merely an encampment, but an army in battle array, is among the favorite expressions of the First Book of Maccabees (GRIMM at 1 Macc. iii. 3). This, however, decides nothing, since the word has the same signification also, Judg. iv. 16; vii. 14, and the discourse immediately returns to 1 Kings xvii., and to 2 Kings iv., by the mention of the women who received back their dead, *ἐξ ἀναστάσεως*, *i. e.*, either by *resurrection* (Böhm., Bl., Lün., *etc.*) or from a resurrection=as raised again to life. These examples from the life of the woman of Sarepta and of the Shunamite, lead, however, again, immediately, to the martyrdom of Eleazer (2 Macc. vi. 18ff.), and of the seven brothers, along with their mother (2 Macc. vii.). The *τύμπανον* is regarded as an engine of torture in the form of a wheel, upon which the tortured person was stretched out like the skin of a kettle-drum, and frequently beaten to death. The *better resurrection* (*κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως*) is regarded by Œc. and Theoph. (by the latter hesitatingly) as contrasted with the resurrection of the ungodly to judgment (Dan. xii. 2); by Chrys., Beng., Böhm., Bl., De W., Ebr. and others, on the contrary, as in antithesis with *ἐξ ἀναστάσεως*, standing at the beginning of the verse; while Gerh., Win., Thol., Lün., *etc.*, more naturally [Alford says "strangely"] place it in contrast with the previously mentioned *ἀπολύτρωσις* (deliverance) from their tortures, which was proffered them.

VER. 36. **And others experienced mockings and scourgings,** *etc.*—Scourgings (*μάστιγες*) and mockings (*ἐμπαιγμοί*) are spoken of, the former at 2 Macc. vii. 1, the latter at id. vii. 7, 10. We may presume with certainty, therefore, that these examples of suffering are suggested by the narratives there recorded, although the *ἕτεροι δέ*, immediately proceeds to introduce other, though kindred examples, among which we may doubtless recognize allusions to the mockeries heaped upon Elisha and Jeremiah. For not only is the stoning immediately mentioned which slew Zachariah, 2 Chron. xxiv. 20, and the sawing asunder, which according to Jewish tradition, fell to the lot of Isaiah, but previously to these, bonds and imprisonment, which may be referred to Hannai (2 Chron. xvi. 10), Micah and Jeremiah, which are connected back by *ἔτι δέ*, with the mockings and scourgings, as if rising upon and transcending them. And the slaying by the edge of the sword, if not referring especially to the prophet Uriah, who was so executed by Jehoiachim (Jer. xxvi. 23), yet certainly must refer to the numerous executions of prophets in the kingdom of Israel (1 Kings xix. 10).—The goat skins, commonly black, expressed still more than the usually white sheep skins, the feelings and the condition of the prophets, who (2 Kings i. 8) are called "hairy men."

VER. 39. **And all these received not the promise,** *etc.*—This sentence refers not merely to the persons mentioned from ver. 35 (Schlicht., Storr), but to the whole body collectively (alike named and unnamed) of those whose faith has procured for them the good report which they have in the Old Testament. The participial clause must be resolved by *although*, not by *since;* for, in the connection, the sense of the clause cannot be that the ancients did not receive the promise because the faith which, in its nature, appertains to the future and the invisible, did not procure for them their good report. The statement, rather, is, that, notwithstanding the glory which they derived from their faith, they still did not obtain the promise. The singular *τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν* shows that the author is speaking not of special and individual promises, and which in fact have not remained unfulfilled, but of the fulfilment of the promise as such, *i. e.*, the Messianic promise, which in the connection is determined still more definitely than the promise of the "eternal inheritance," ch. ix. 15, as that whose attainment presupposes the *τελείωσις*.

VER. 40. **God having provided something better for us.**—The reason of the fact just mentioned, is God's gracious regard for us, which has led Him to adopt such an arrangement, that the actual *receiving of the promise* is accorded to us, if we abide in the faith, while yet those fathers who are eulogized for their faith, are not excluded, but attain in like manner the *τελείωσις*, only not without us, as would have been the case if their faith had been immediately rewarded with the promised good, and no *interval* had come in between the faith and the attainment. Since, then, the *τελείωσις* still, also, awaits us, and will be attained only at the second coming of Christ, we are, on the one hand, *on a level with the fathers;* and, notwithstanding our

faith, have, like them, to submit to *a period of waiting*, which also gives ample scope for Christian endurance—while thus their life of faith can furnish us a comforting and stimulating example—and on the other a *better thing* (κρεῖττόν τι) has been provided for us. The fulfilment of the *Messianic* promise has, with the appearance of Jesus Christ and His entrance into the heavenly All-holy, become matter of historical fact, so that the prophecy of Jeremiah is fulfilled ch. viii. 6 ff.; x. 15 ff. Even Abraham ἐπέτυχεν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ch. vi. 15 ff., and the ἔσχατον τῶν ἡμερῶν (i. 1), and the συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων (ix. 26), lies already behind us. We have *lived to behold* the final revelation of God in Jesus Christ, and hence the Lord pronounces His disciples *blessed*, and declares them privileged above the prophets and kings of the Old Testament, Matth. xiii. 17. Thus has something better been imparted to us than to them, comp. ch. ii. 3 ff. This reference of the κρεῖττον to the nobler boon bestowed on us than was accorded to the ancients, harmonizes better with the language ch. vii. 19; viii. 6, and with the general scope of the Epistle, than the explanation: "Something better, then, would have fallen to our lot, if they had received the *final* fulfilment of the promise." The connecting thought would then be, that in such a case we *should not have been born*, inasmuch as the end of the world would have arrived, and with it that state of perfection in which is neither marrying nor giving in marriage, Matt. xxi. 30.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The greatest and most important victories are not gained by the might of armies, nor even by mere patriotic heroism, but by the *power of the Omnipotent* God who, beyond their prayers and their comprehension, assists those who, in undoubting faith, adapt themselves to His arrangements, and employ the means which He points out to them.

2. Faith triumphs not merely over visible opponents and adversaries; it gives us victory also over *spiritual foes*, and makes those who were once sinners, *associates and helpers of the servants of God*, for which again God, to whom they have given honor, becomes to them a tower and shield, and bestows upon them grace unto salvation.

3. Faith, however, shows its beauty, power, and greatness, not barely in that which it *accomplishes*, *overthrows*, and *attains*, but also in that which it *sustains*, *endures*, and *sacrifices*. And in this, *women* are not inferior to men, but give them not unfrequently an inspiring *example*.

4. The life of believers in the world is a perpetual *conflict with the world*, whose SEVERITY evinces itself as clearly in their *deportment* as in their *destinies*. But the conflict is lightened by the fact that the inestimable *worth* of believers always shines forth more conspicuous and triumphant alike in their voluntary privations and sacrifices, and amidst violent oppressions and spoliations, while the world, on the contrary, by its denial, contempt, and rejection of those who, in the sight of God, are more highly esteemed than the whole world, condemns, punishes, and impoverishes itself.

5. The final goal to which God conducts believers, is *perfection in Christ;* and this embraces the *entire person*, includes thus the resurrection and glorification of the body, and pre-supposes, therefore, the second coming of Christ. *It thus, therefore, equally awaits us* as the members of the Old Covenant who fell asleep in faith, with whom we have in common the *interval of waiting*, trials of our faith, and sufferings for the sake of faith, so that they are, to us, *examples* and *patterns* in the various matters with which they have to do. *For at the same time with them* shall we attain this final and comprehensive perfection, and come to the *common enjoyment* of the same blessedness. Thus the prerogative which we have enjoyed, in that the first appearance of Christ was not, with us, a matter of expectation, but of realization, binds us to all the greater humility, thankfulness, and fidelity, by how much the more clearly we discern in this arrangement the *grace of God, taking thought for our salvation.*

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The like *state of mind*, the like *goal*, and the like *destiny* of the believers of all ages.—The relation of the believers to the *world* and to *God*.—The *enemies*, *conflicts*, and *victories* of faith.—*Dishonored* in the world, *honored* with God.—The *transformation* produced by faith.—The certain *fulfilment* of the promises of God: 1, in its *means;* 2, in its *conditions;* 3, in its *stages.*

STARKE:—He who dwells in heaven must assuredly laugh at those who defiantly trust to walls and ramparts.—In like manner, as at the sound of the trumpet and battle-cry of Israel, the walls of the ungodly city of Jericho fell, thus shall the trumpet voice of the Gospel overthrow the kingdom of anti-christ, Rev. xviii. 2.—Sin separates from God; but repentance conducts to God (Isa. lix. 2; Jer. iii. 1).—Good works must be judged not according to the appearance, but according to their ground and internal character.—The Holy Scripture is so rich in beautiful and memorable histories and examples, that we have no need of the fabulous inventions of the monks, but enough for our right instruction in the word of God.—Oh God! how rich art Thou even in the gifts and treasures which Thou hast deposited in Thy saints!—Faith is stronger than powder and lead, than arrow, sword, and weapon of war. It can overcome even the devil himself, and quench his fiery darts (Eph. vi. 16).—Rather should we endure a violent death, than apostatize from the true religion.—The host of sacred martyrs is very comforting to all the suffering bearers of the cross; for we are no better than our fathers (1 Kings xix. 4). O Thou God that hidest Thyself! Thou leavest Thy children here to suffering and oppression, that they may have life and refreshment forever (Rev. xii. 12).—Much distress, trouble and misery upon earth; yet the sufferings of this present time are of no account beside the glory which shall be revealed in us (Rom. viii. 18).—O how are we put to shame who live under the New Covenant by the heroes of faith who lived under the Old.—Steadfastness in true religion under great affliction, is a proof of true faith in Christ.

Rieger:—Unbelief is always hatching distrust. "Surely there is no remedy; in great public calamities must all fare alike." But faith trusts God in all ways.—God, in His economy and arrangement of times, has graciously cared for all. Even to the ancients He has vouchsafed, in their time, sufficient evidence for faith.

Hahn:—The world speedily forgets the deeds of its heroes, however much it may wish to perpetuate them; but God bears testimony to His own. This is genuine, and will remain.—If we can do no very great deed in our time, it is enough if we exercise victorious faith in endurance, as this is the task assigned to our time (Rev. xiii.).—Even trivial acts, if they spring from faith, are highly esteemed of God.

Heubner:—Faith overcomes the world.—The richness of the Holy Scripture in instructive examples. The richness of the gifts that God has deposited in the saints.—The hidden value of the righteous is manifest in the sight of God.—The Christian should be exalted above the world, but the world should learn to be worthy of the godly. —How often do innocence and truth have to conceal and withdraw themselves. He, who shall yet dwell in the eternal mansions, now often wanders without a shelter.—Many pious men fail to live to see the fulfilment of their desires; but their salvation will not fail.—Heaven unites all.

FOURTH SECTION.

A COMPREHENSIVE APPEAL, BASED ON THE PRECEDING RETROSPECT.

I.

In possession of such examples, and looking away to Jesus Himself, the readers must maintain, with steadfastness, the struggle that awaits them.

Chapter XII. 1–3.

Wherefore, seeing we also are [let also us, being] compassed about with so great a
cloud of witnesses, let us [*om.* let us] lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so
easily beset *us*, and let us run with patience [steadfastness] the race [contest, ἀγῶνα]
2 that is set before us, Looking [away] unto Jesus the author [Leader] and finisher [Perfecter] of *our* faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the [a] cross, de-
spising the shame [making light of shame], and is set down [hath sat down][1] at the
3 right hand of the throne of God. For consider him that [hath] endured such contra-
diction of [ὑπό, *by*, *from*] sinners against himself,[2] lest ye [in order that ye may not] be
wearied and faint [ἐκλυόμενοι, *relaxing*, *fainting*] in your minds.

[1] Ver. 2.—The Perf. κεκάθικεν has the sanction of all the uncials and most of the minusc., as against the Rec. ἐκάθισεν. [The Eng. ver. correctly, as to the sense, *is set down*].

[2] Ver. 3.—The reading εἰς ἑαυτόν (instead of εἰς αὐτόν or εἰς αὑτόν, which is found in D***. K. L., and nearly all the minusc., is directly sustained by A. and the Vulg.; indirectly by the senseless plurals, εἰς ἑαυτούς. in D*. E*., Pesh. and Sin.

[Ver. 1.—Τοιγαροῦν, *therefore*, weighty and impressive in classical Greek; τοι probably for τῷ, *by this*, γάρ, *for*, οὖν, *then*, now; the whole—*for by this now*, hence, *therefore*.—καὶ ἡμεῖς, *let also us*; ἡμεῖς, emphatic; in E. V., the emphasis partly given in the "we also."—τοσοῦτον, *etc.*, *having so great a crowd of witnesses encompassing us*, scil., like the spectators in the stadium, but μάρτυρες, having probably a double reference to their character as *spectators*, and as witnesses to the faith. The Greek word, like the English, has both meanings, and probably for the same reason, viz., that a *witness* must naturally have been a *beholder* of that to which he witnesses.—ὄγκον, *bulk*, *weight*, unnatural swelling or protuberance; and may refer primarily to unnatural bulk of the body itself; then to extraneous burdens.—εὐπερίστατον, probably *easily placing itself around*, *easily besetting*,—δι' ὑπομονῆς, *by means of steadfastness*, *through*, *in the midst of*, *steadfastness*, hence taken adverbially, *steadfastly*, *perseveringly*.

Ver. 2.—ἀφορῶντες, *looking away*, ἀρχηγόν, *file-leader*, *captain* (chap. ii. 10), τελειωτήν, *perfecter*.—ἀντί, *over against*, *in return for*, *in exchange for*, hence here, *in consideration of*.—ὑπέμεινεν σταυρόν, *endured a cross*.—αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσας, *making light of shame*, not specifically, the shame of the cross, but shame taken abstractly.—κεκάθικεν, *has sat down*, and still holds his seat.

Ver. 3.—ἀναλογίσασθε, not adequately rendered by English, *consider* (which is used elsewhere for κατανοῶ, *etc.*), and difficult to express in English; *think over analogously*, or by way of comparison; Beng.: "*comparatione instituta cogitate;*" τὸν ὑπομεμενηκότα, *him who hath endured* (Perf.); not merely *suffered* (πάσχειν), but *stood under*, *abided*.—ταῖς ψυχ. ἐκλυόμενοι. *fainting in your souls*.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. Therefore let also us.—Τοιγαροῦν (familiar in classical Greek, but in the N. T. confined to this passage and 1 Thess. iv. 8) connects with the preceding O. T. examples the following exhortation to like conduct: the exhortation being couched in imagery, and technical expressions drawn from the Grecian games, with whose usages the Jews were sufficiently familiar. The phrase νέφος μαρτύρων at the outset, containing an

allusion to this imagery, although it is rendered distinct only by the more explicit reference which follows. The sum of the passage is this: The capital thought expressed by the verb τρέχωμεν is an *exhortation to the race*, while the two participial clauses with ἔχοντες and ἀποθέμενοι intimate, the former what we *possess* for our incitement in the enveloping cloud of witnesses, and the latter, what we must previously *have done* to our persons in order to facilitate our progress. Unquestionably, now, δι' ὑπομονῆς attached to τρέχωμεν, as more specially characterizing the race, looks back to ch. x. 36, and alike the preëminence given to πίστις in v. 2, and the τοιγαροῦν of v. 1, show a clear reference to ch. xi. Yet all this does not require us, with Lün., to explain μάρτυρες *exclusively* of witnesses of faith. On the one hand, we must not overlook the fact, that the persons signalized in ch. xi. are designated as those who, on account of their faith, have *received* a good report, or testimony (not as those who have *borne* it), ch. xi. 2, 4, 5, 39; and on the other, we must remember that here, at v. 2, the eyes of those running are turned to *Jesus*, as ἀρχηγός and τελειωτής of faith, and this in such a way that the ἀφορῶντες standing coordinate with ἔχοντες forms a *second* ground of exhortation to zeal in the *race*, and the ὑπομονή of Jesus is evolved from His history, thus brought into relation to the imagery of the stadium. The expositor, therefore, may be justified in taking the cloud of μαρτύρων, lifted above the earth, not, indeed, *exclusively* (with Bleek, De Wette, Thol., Bisp., *etc.*), but still *primarily*, as *witnesses*, or *spectators* of the *struggle*, and treat its meaning of *witnesses of faith* as not, indeed, properly combining itself with the former (with Del., Riehm, Alf.), nor again as entirely merged and lost in it. For the question is not at all one of mere spectators, but of sympathizing witnesses, witnesses who have been tried in a like conflict with our own, but have already reached the goal of perfection, and whose person and history are precisely on this account, patterns and incitements to us. The διά, with the Gen., with verbs of motion, serves to designate the *continuance* of the movement, the permanent and habitual character of the act (Bernhardy, p. 239). So here δι' ὑπομονῆς as διὰ πίστεως, 2 Cor. v. 7.

That easily besets us.—The word εὐπερίστατον is as an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον of doubtful signification. Carpz., Schultz, Stein explain it actively =*seducing, enticing;* but this sense cannot be established. The signification, *easily changing*= unstable, movable (Matthäi), is inappropriate. The absence of the object prevents our taking it actively; and since elsewhere all derivations from ἵστημι have either an intransitive or passive meaning, this word can scarcely constitute an exception. The passive meaning, however, *easily got around, avoided*, or *easily encompassed=overcome* (Chrys., *etc.*), is far-fetched, and unsuited to the context. The same is true of Ernesti's explanation; *eagerly encompassed and thronged*, hence, *universally prized and beloved.* We must therefore go back to the middle signification, and may either, with John Gerh., Bl., De W., Lün., Riehm, *etc.*, refer it to sin, like a garment closely and constantly encompassing and hindering the runner; or (with Anselm, Horneius, Calv., Grot., Ebr., Del., *etc.*) to the fact that it everywhere easily besets us, and subtly encompasses us, so as to hinder and obstruct our way. A recurrence to the noun περίστασις for the sense, *easily involving us in evil, plunging us into danger, creating hinderances* (Theophyl., Beng., and others), is totally unnecessary. Calv., Chemnitz, Seb. Schmidt, and others, refer the word too restrictedly to *hereditary* sin, implied also in Luther's rendering, "which ever cleaves to us." Bugenhagen renders more correctly, "*semper oppugnans;*" and in part, Œcolamp., who, however, reduces the force of his rendering *peccatum quod nos proxime circumstat*, by the added clause, "*sive tenaciter nobis inhæret.*" The rendering of Grynæus, "*ad nos circumcingendos proclive,*" reaches about the exact idea.—For giving to ὄγκος the figurative meaning of *self-sufficiency, high-mindedness* (Beng., and others), we have no warrant from the context.

Ver. 2. **The Leader and Perfecter of faith.**—Ἀρχηγός denotes not merely the *originator*, who works in us the beginning of faith (Chrys., Erasm., Lün., and the majority), but, as at ch. ii. 10, the *leader, marshaller*, who, in the exhibition of patient and victorious faith, has preceded us, as a pattern and an aid, comp. ch. ii. 13; iii. 2. "How were it possible that faith could not be predicated of Jesus? For *between* Him and His eternal and strictly *divine* life had His earthly life, having become by the power of sin and wrath a thick prison wall, placed itself as a wall of partition, which, until it was actually broken through and done away, was non-existent *only* to His far-reaching and transcending faith—for that faith, by virtue of which, even in the very midst of the darkness of utter desertion, He could still call God "His God!"* So soon as we recognize in its terrible and deadly earnestness the self-abnegation of the eternal Son, we cannot wonder that, while that state continued, the author designates *faith* as the bond between Him and God" (Del.). The train of thought involves the idea that Jesus also, by enduring to the end, set forth and made manifest faith in its perfection (Riehm). It is not enough to say with Del. that Jesus, through affliction, entering into glory, has obtained for us ultimate salvation, styled, 1 Pet. i. 9, τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως. When faith is ascribed to Jesus Christ it must, in His person, in accordance with His uniformly developed character (ch. v. 8, 9), bear the stamp of perfection. Thus τελειωτής receives its usual transitive signification. And the sentiment may well be that in His display of faith Jesus also in His own person brought it to perfection (Theod., Beng., Bl., De W., Thol., Ebr., Bisp., *etc.*), and not merely that He brings it to perfection in us (Chrys., Lün., Del., *etc.*). Some, with Grot., take the idea of τελειωτής, too narrowly, as referring to the *judge in the games* (=βραβεύς).

For the joy that was set before him.—The joy refers not merely to the finished work of redemption, and the blessings it brings to men (Theodoret): it is the heavenly joy, the obtaining of which was to be the reward of Jesus' suffering on the cross (Primas. and the most). This idea of ἀντί is demanded by the connection. From a misconception of it have arisen the renderings: "instead of the heavenly glory which

He had as the preëxistent and premundane Logos (Pesh., Greg. Nazianz., Beza, *etc.*); or: "instead of the worldly joys and pleasures which it was in His power to enjoy" (Calv., Carpz., Stein, Bisp., *etc.;* or: "instead of that freedom from earthly suffering which, as the sinless One, He might have secured for himself" (Chrys., Calov, *etc.*).

Ver. 3. **For consider him,** *etc.*—'Αναλογίζεσθαι expresses a *consideration* that *compares* and *weighs*. The hortatory ἀφορῶντες, *looking away*, which "implies the concentration of the wandering gaze into a single direction," assigns the ground or condition of the preceding admonition; and this again now itself assumes the form of an exhortation. The words ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν are not (with Luth., Beng., *etc.*) to be connected with κάμητε, but with ἐκλυόμενοι (Bez., Bl., and the most), which would otherwise form an awkward and dragging close.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Without *steadfastness of faith* the goal is not to be attained. But this steadfastness shows itself not merely as the power of unfailing *patience* in suffering, and as unbending *firmness* in trials, but also, as courageous *persistency* in the noblest striving, and as unyielding *exertion* in struggling for the highest goal.

2. Since without such exertion, the Christian's life-race cannot be happily terminated, it becomes the *duty of self-preservation* to divest ourselves of every thing which obstructs these endeavors, and hinders our progress to the goal. But that which most hinders our progress is *sin*, which partly cleaves to us by nature, as an oppressive burden, and a dragging fetter, and partly, whithersoever we turn, encounters us, and seeks to block up our way.

3. The most powerful incitement, and the surest means against that relaxing of effort which has its ground in spiritual *feebleness*, is an *uninterrupted looking to Jesus*, the perfected hero of faith, the greatest sufferer, the perfect conqueror, the theanthropic helper. "He has preceded us in the race of faith, and has opened the way, in commencing for us the struggle of faith. But He is also at the same time the perfecter of faith, infusing by His redemption into the believing combatants the power to achieve all and to bear off the victory." Thus Von Gerlach, not incorrectly, and yet not exhaustively, for Jesus is a *pattern* and *helper* in our race and conflict of faith, only in so far as in His own life He has wrought out and exhibited the *personal living image* of this course and conflict in its entire perfection. The idea that Jesus is to be regarded merely as an *object*, and not also as a *subject*, of faith, entirely destroys, when logically carried out, alike *the reality of His history* and the *genuineness of His moral and religious perfection*, and thus comes into direct conflict, not merely with the representations of the evangelists, as, for example, respecting our Saviour's life of *prayer*, but also the entire conception and scope of our Epistle. For this in the very passage before us runs a parallel between *our* struggle with the adversaries of the Gospel and the struggles of the Redeemer, and also in the case of Jesus it regards His *continuance* in the conflict as the *condition* of his τελείωσις, which again harmonizes entirely with the representation given at Phil. ii. 9 (comp. Thol.).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The *witnesses*, the *enemies*, and the *auxiliaries* of our conflict of faith.—The Christian's *course of life*, a *course of suffering*, and a *race for victory*.—Jesus the *archetype* and *prototype* of believers who go through *suffering to glory*.—*Steadfastness in faith*, in its *necessity*, its *difficulty*, and its *practicability*.—What occasions us to *faint*, and what secures us *against* it.—The greatest *sufferer* is the most *valiant* hero. He who is most *disciplined* can best *help* others.—How they who are *withdrawn* from us still remain near to us.

Starke:—What noble incitements have we in our conflict of faith! Christ who has preceded us in it, and supplies us with all power for it; a cloud of witnesses of faith, who have set us an example in this conflict; and the benefit of this conflict, whose fruit is eternal bliss.—Sin must be borne as a life-long companion, even by the children of God, and they have therein an enemy on which they may exercise their spiritual knighthood.—Although sin cleaves to man, it is not the essence of man; hence in heaven the elect are perfect.—God Himself arranged the knightly combat and the place of the tournament; on this every Christian must plant himself, and display his deeds of Christian prowess.—In the work of salvation every thing depends on Jesus.—The best lightening of the burden of the cross is that thou look away from it unto Jesus.—If thou hast not joy in the world, rejoice in thy cross; speedily enough thou wilt attain to true joy and glory.—It is the nature of man to shrink from the cross; hence we need to arouse and incite ourselves to the bearing of the cross that is so useful to us.—If we are assailed on account of our right doing in Christ, we should console ourselves with the example of Christ, strengthen our courage, and remember that we shall be abundantly rewarded in heaven (Matth. v. 11-12).—However much we may suffer for the name of Christ, Christ has still suffered far more for our sakes.

Rieger:—Faith does not sleep, but watches and runs; yet neither does it hasten; but it waits in patience, and thus the prescribed conflict is accomplished, extremes on both sides avoided, and the way of truth preserved.—Faith looks to Jesus Christ, and is thus drawn into his footsteps.

Hahn:—Presumption and timid unbelief are the two capital faults against which patience alone can aid by preserving us in true moderation, and in the middle path.

Heubner:—The true use of biblical types and patterns is not idle and unfruitful contemplation, but imitation.—Sin is the heaviest burden that drags us down to earth.—Christian virtue is a free, cheerful wrestling and running after the heavenly jewel. The spirit must be deaf to a certain shame; the bearing of such shame leads to the highest honor.—That which allures and misleads in sufferings is this, that we must allow ourselves to find pleasure in those who are sinful and unworthy.

MENKEN:—Walk like Jesus! and that thou mayest walk *like* Him, walk *with* Him; and thus shalt thou walk *to* Him.

HARLESS (IV. 5):—Wherein lies the courage of a true Christian?

GEROK:—The glorious cloud of witnesses about the throne of the Redeemer of the world: 1. their bloody wounds; 2. their glorious banner; 3. their heavenly crowns.

G. VON ZEZSCHWITZ (*Testimonies of the good Shepherd*, 1864):—Looking to Jesus is our comfort and victory in all conflicts and sufferings. For looking to Jesus involves 1. at the commencement of the struggle, looking immediately to the victorious issue: 2. if it continues long, seeing before us *the* highest model of patience; 3. recognizing in suffering itself a comforting seal of our Divine sonship.

II.

Their sufferings are profitable chastisements of the paternal love of God.

CHAPTER XII. 4–13.

4, 5 Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin. And ye have forgotten
the exhortation which speaketh unto you as unto children [sons], My son, despise
not thou [make not light of] the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou are
6 rebuked [while being probed, corrected, ἐλεγχόμενος] of [by] him; For whom the
7 Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening [It is for chastisement that ye endure],[1] God dealeth with you as
8 with sons; for what son is he [who is a son] whom the father chasteneth not? But if
ye be [are] without chastisement, whereof all are [have become] partakers, then
9 are ye bastards, and not sons. Furthermore [εἶτα, then, then again], we have had
[we had, used to have the] fathers of our flesh which [who] corrected us [as chasteners], and we gave *them* reverence: shall we not much rather[2] be in subjection unto
10 the Father of spirits and live? For they verily [indeed] for [*or*, with reference to] a few
days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for *our* profit, that *we* might [may]
11 be partakers of his holiness. Now no chastening for the present [in respect indeed to
the present] seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless [but], afterward it
yieldeth the peaceable [peaceful] fruit of righteousness unto them which are [which
12 have been] exercised [disciplined] thereby. Wherefore lift up [right up again]
13 the hands which hang down, and the feeble [relaxed] knees; And make straight
paths for your feet, lest [that] that which is lame [may not] be turned out of the
way; but let it [may] rather be healed.

1 Ver. 7.—Instead of εἰ read εἰς, after Sin. A. D. E. K. L., and most minusc. Reiche, however, defends the Rec.

2 Ver. 9.—Οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον, sanctioned by Sin. A. D*., instead of the *lect. rec.* οὐ πολλῷ μᾶλλον.

[Ver. 4.—ἀντικατέστητε, *ye resisted*, Aor.: Words. lays stress on the Aor.—"as ye might have done on several occasions." Alf., with most, makes it—perfect. With οὔπω the Aor. rendering is harsh, unless we render *not in any way*, *not at all*, and take ἀντικατ. of a specific internal conflict with the sin of disobedience and apostasy, as the Saviour's in Gethsemane; then μέχρις αἵματος, refers to the Saviour's sweating drops of blood. I incline with Barnes to this interpretation.

Ver. 5.—ἐκλέλησθε, *ye have forgotten*, much better than interrog., *have ye forgotten?* as Bl., De W., Lün., in order to soften what otherwise seems too harsh; but this forgetting is virtually assumed below, and the interrog. would be awkward.—ὀλιγωρεῖν, *make little account of*, not so strong as *despise*.—ἐλεγχόμενος, while being *probed*, *sifted*, *corrected*, rather than *rebuked*.

Ver. 7.—εἰς παιδείαν ὑπομένετε, so the best authorities; *it is for chastening or discipline that ye are enduring*. Alf. argues that ὑπομένειν can hardly have the *incidental* meaning which the ordinary reading requires.—τίς γάρ ἐστιν υἱός, *for who is a son?*

Ver. 8.—μέτοχοι γεγόναμεν, *we have become partakers*.

Ver. 9.—εἶτα, *then*, *in the next place*. Unless we take εἶτα as a particle of indignant emotion, which I think better. This would indeed require, in a regular construction, οὐ πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον (not as Bl. and Alf., καὶ οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον); but that the author *began* with this construction in his mind, is shown by the μέν after τούς, which has not its answering δέ.

Ver. 10.—πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας, *with reference to a few days*, or, perhaps, with Moll, *etc*, *during*.

Ver. 11.—τοῖς δι' αὐτῆς γεγυμνασμένοις, *to those that have been trained by means of it*.—ἀποδίδωσιν, *it renders back*, *yields*.—δικαιοσύνης, emphatically placed.

Ver. 12.—ἀνορθώσατε, *right up*, *bring back to erectness* or *straightness*.—παρειμένας, *slackened*, *unstrung*.—παραλελυμένα, *paralysed*, relaxed.

Ver. 13.—καὶ τροχιὰς ὀρθὰς, *etc.*, is a regular Dactylic Hexameter: ἵνα μὴ τὸ χωλὸν ἐκτραπῇ, part of an Iambic trimeter, as in ver. 14, οὗ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν κύριον, is a perfect Iambic verse.—K.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 4. **Resisted unto blood.**—The expression is hardly a figure drawn from boxing (Beng., Bl., Del.), but denotes a bloody death (Wieseler), with a reference to the death of Jesus, and implies that the readers have indeed already been subjected to acts of violence (ch. x. 32 ff.), but have not as yet, like earlier members of the Church (chap. xiii. 7), been persecuted unto death, but rather are in their conduct, shielding themselves from such perils, and forget the import of the sufferings which God destines for His children. A moral struggle against their own sin, and one in which they have not put forth their utmost exertions (so recently again HOLTZMANN in the *Stud. und Krit.*, 1859, II.) is here not intended. [I incline to think it is, and that in this consists the rebuking character of the language.—K.]. Sin appears here as an objective worldly power, as it appears in particular in the enemies of the Gospel, and prepares the same suffering for the disciples, as for the Lord.

VER. 5. **And ye have forgotten,** *etc.*—If with Calv., Beza, Bl., Lün., *etc.*, we take these words interrogatively, the tone of reproof is softened [and the passage enfeebled]. The citation is from Prov. iii. 11, 12, where in Heb. the concluding clause runs, "and as a father to the son, He is good to him" (or, receives him kindly). instead of וּכְאָב the Sept. read either כְּאֵב, or as Job v. 17, יַכְאִב, *he occasions pain.* The Cod. A. of the Sept. reads with fifteen other MSS. παιδεύει; the remainder have ἐλέγχει.

VER. 7. **For chastisement.**—The *lect. rec.* εἰ has the parallels, ver. 8, in its favor; still this cannot decide us against the authorities, which by no means present us an unmeaning clerical error, but assign the object of the suffering, which is the first mentioned παιδεία. Εἰς, denoting purpose, is frequent in our Epistle, chap. iv. 14; iii. 5; iv. 16; vi. 16; ix. 15; x. 19; xi. 11. The Indic. construction corresponds better with the connection (Chrys., Del.) than the Imper. (Ebr.), especially considering the pregnant signification of ὑπομένειν and the δέ in ver. 8. Again τίς is not to be taken adjectively with υἱός (Bl., De W., Thol., Lün.), nor as predicate=*of what sort perchance is the son?* (Böhme) but as a substantive, as also υἱός and πατήρ, are without the article. Thus the sense is, according to Del., "where is there one who stands in truth in the relation of son, whom He does not chastise, who stands to Him in truth in the relation of father?"

VER. 9. **Again, [in the next place].**—εἶτα continues the argumentation.—To take the word as ironical, or as a question of surprise=to *ita ne* (Valck., Alberti, *etc.*) is consistent with classical usage, but is here forced, besides which also, the second member of the sentence should have commenced with καί.

Father of spirits.—This is not Christ (Hammond), but God, who, however, receives this designation not as one *caring* for our souls (Böhm. after Morus, and others), nor as bestower of the gifts of the Spirit (Theodoret), nor in the moral sense, as Father, in respect to the higher spiritual province of life (De W., Ebr., Lün.); but inasmuch as all spirits are derived from Him (Thol., Del., Riehm). We must not, however, refer the "spirits" exclusively to *angels* (Chrys., Œc., Theoph.); nor find here a one-sided and extreme statement of *creatianism* (Calv., Beng., Este, Carpz., *etc.*), but only a moderate and authorized form, as at ch. vii. 10, of *Traducianism.*

VER. 10. **For a few days.**—The πρός stands here, and ver. 11; Luke viii. 13; 1 Cor. vii. 5; 2 Cor. vii. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 17, of the *duration* of the chastisement. The majority of expositors, with Calvin, regard the "few days" as the days of our *earthly life;* and thus find a contrast expressed between the purpose of the chastisement of children by our earthly parents, as being *with reference to,* or for (πρός), *a few days,* and the *eternity,* which is the end and scope of the Divine chastisements. Such an interpretation, however, introduces at once a false statement into the first member of the antithesis—that, *viz:* which restricts the end of *human* training in all cases to our earthly life, and creates a contrast for which the original furnishes no basis. But neither, on the other hand, is the πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας to be attached equally to both members of the antithesis, as stating the *common* period of time during which, for their respectively different purposes, and in their different ways, the human and the Divine training are carried forward (Bleek, *etc.*). The few days point to the brief period of *minority,* during which, as shown by the Imperfect ἐπαίδευον, the readers, as children, were the subjects of parental discipline. But neither again does the author contrast with this limited period of parental training the *life-long* continuance of the Divine education. Of this the text contains nothing whatever. Its phraseology shows rather that any such special contrast with πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας is utterly out of the author's mind; and, in fact, Delitzsch is obliged to extract it artificially and unnaturally from the εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ἁγιότητος αὐτοῦ, making πρός unite the ideas of *time* and *purpose,* and εἰς those of *purpose* and *result,* while the clause with πρός expresses the limit as to time, and that with εἰς that of aim and object. The diversity of the human and the Divine παιδεία is briefly given in their respective characteristic features, and the preëminence of the latter is urged upon the attention of the readers (who have had personal experience of the former), that they may the more willingly submit themselves to it. The abstract ἁγιότης is found elsewhere only at 2 Macc. xv. 2. [In regard to the construction of the vexed passage above, we may, in the first place, set aside at once the idea of Wets., Storr, Kuin., Böhm., and Bleek, that πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας is to be understood of the second member of the sentence, as implying a restriction in the *time* of the discipline, alike of the human and the Divine, both being confined to the present life. This, however true, is clearly not expressed in the sentence; πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας belongs only to the first member. But, so restricted, are we to explain it as "for, *i. e., during* a few days," *viz:* the few days of our minority, in which we were subject to their chastisement, or, as "*with reference to a few days,*" *viz.*, the days of our earthly life? The objection to this latter, hinted at by Moll, and more fully expressed by Alford, *viz.*, that it is

not true that the discipline of earthly parents always "has regard only to the present life," seems to me without force; inasmuch as the author's statement is simply a *general* one, not referring to what may be the possible scope of the training of Christian parents, but what is the natural scope of human and earthly discipline *as such*. Alford's next objection (as also Moll's), *viz.*, that the contrast thus implied between the *transitory* purpose of human chastisement, and the *eternal* purpose of the Divine, is superinduced on the passage because "there is not one word in the latter clause expressing the eternal nature of God's purpose," he subsequently answers himself by placing the *πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας* in contrast with the *ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον*, in which, he says, "we have set over against one another the short time *during* which, the temporary reference *with* which their chastisement was inflicted, and the great purpose implied *as eternal* from its very expression, as *τὸ συμφέρον* for an immortal being, in which he chastises us." The question, then, is whether, with Moll, we are to take *πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας* as simply like our "for=during a few days," or, with many others, to take it as="with reference to a few days." If the former, then the clause *κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς*, of the first member is set over against the two clauses in the second. If the latter, then we have a double antithesis, and the question arises, whether we are to take it, with Alford, in the natural order of the clauses ("for a few days" against "for our profit," and "according to their pleasure" against "in order to participate in his holiness") or, with Delitzsch, *chiastically*, the second of the one corresponding to the first of the other, and the first of the one to the second of the other. It does not follow, however, necessarily, that, even if we take *πρός*, *with reference to*, there still is any such exact antithesis intended as either of these explanations implies. I incline, on the one hand, to take *πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας* as *in reference to a few days* (which seems to me to have much more point than the other), and, on the other, to doubt even then if the writer intends any exactly balanced antithesis. He puts the two grand points of earthly correction, *viz.*, its being but for and with reference to a few days, and its possessing, even in the best, the character more or less of arbitrariness, against the one grand point of the Divine, *viz.*, its intrinsic and essential profitableness, in which, however, a contrast to both the other characteristics is virtually implied.—K.].

VER. 11. **Peaceful fruit of righteousness.**—As the tree which bears the fruit is the *παιδεία*, *δικαιοσύνης* cannot be the Gen. Subj.—as even recently Klee supposes. The Gen. is Gen. of apposition (James iii. 18). The adj. *εἰρηνικός* stands in relation to *δι' αὐτῆς γεγυμνασμένοις*, so that the *παιδεία* is regarded under the point of view of *γυμνασία=ἀγών* (Thol., Del., *etc.*).

VER. 12. **Wherefore raise up again,** *etc.*—The first clause borrows both thought and language from Is. xxxv. 3; the other from Prov. iv. 26. The Pass. Signif. given by many since and with Grot. to *ἐκτρέπ.*, *to be dislocated, distorted*, is unsustained by usage. The original text, the expression of the Sept. *ποίει σοῖς ποσί*, and partially the following clause with *ἵνα*, lead us to take the *τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν*, not as *Dat. instrum.* (It., Vulg., Luth., Bl., De W., Thol., Lün.), but as *Dat. commodi* (Böhm., Ebr., Del., Riehm, Alf.). [We may call attention to the lofty and rythmical character of the language here. *Καὶ τροχιὰς ὀρθάς, etc.*, is a perfect Dactylic hexameter; *ἵνα μὴ τὸ χωλόν, etc.*, is a rough and irregular Iambic trimeter, while the general cast of the expression is decidedly poetic. See textual note, and vv. 14, 15.—K.].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Sin which *reigns* in the world, and is mighty in the children of unbelief, is often also skilful to employ *violent measures* against the professors of the true faith, and to threaten not merely their property and honor, but their life. In such cases it behooves them to be faithful and obedient even *unto death.*

2. Yet even where matters do not come to extremities, still there are frequently sorrows and sufferings, painful and heavy. In them we must recognize not mere violent acts of men, not mere undeserved strokes of fortune, but *the hand of God*, yet still, as of a father who regards our interests, and by *his discipline of suffering*, is bringing into clear recognition, and stamping with the seal of validity, *that filial* relation to which he has received us in Christ.

3. There are, thus, sufferings which stand indeed in connection with *our own* sinfulness, and have the significance of *chastisement*, yet still are not punitive sufferings, such as would give us to taste the wrath of God, but *strokes inflicted by Divine love*, as *means of paternal chastisement* for the purpose of *educating us for the heavenly kingdom.*

4. If we recognize this *Divine purpose*, and find in the painful, yet *salutary* chastisings, a recognition, confirmation, and development of our filial relation to God, then we shall all the more readily submit ourselves, in humility and patience, to these chastisements, which have their ultimate *ground* in the love of God, and their true *end* and *aim* in His desire for our salvation, the more clearly we perceive that this loving chastisement of our *heavenly* Father immeasurably transcends that of earthly fathers.

5. This submission is entirely *authorized, obligatory and salutary:* for, while our parents can only endow us with merely natural life, but cannot change our fleshly nature, and during our minority are influenced by personal, and sometimes selfish views, in the application of the means of chastisement, so that the results are often either inconsiderable or uncertain, God, as the Father of spirits, is also the author of our spiritual nature, and by the means of education which He employs, makes us partakers of His holiness, of the *Divine nature* (2 Pet. i. 4). *Thus life*, in its fullest sense, is the consequence of such a subjection to the dispensations and leadings of God; and the end of this discipline of suffering, is a fruit which consists in righteousness, and the taste of which is peace.

6. "The entire falling away of the unconfirmed, wavering members of the Church, can be guarded against, and their recovery be rendered possible, only by the opening of straight paths on the part of the entire body, only by their

going forward in a plain, simple, upright course of thought, confession and action, which shall exercise upon the weak such a salutary and restorative influence as straight and even paths upon lame and diseased feet" (Del.).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

If God *comforts us as a father*, we must allow ourselves *to* be *chastised* as *children*.—Points of likeness and unlikeness in *human* and *Divine* education.—That which *pains*, *comforts*, and *blesses* us in sufferings.—The sweetness, not only of the *means*, but of the *mode* of God's comforting us in suffering.—Our filial relation to God teaches us *not lightly to regard* afflictions, not to *faint* in them, but to be *improved* by them.

STARKE:—The thing which is not pleasant to us, we can easily forget (Ps. lxxxviii. 18); but he who often calls to mind the cross, will be less surprised by it when it comes (1 Pet. iv. 12).—To make an honest application to one's self, is the most important thing in the reading of the Holy Scripture (Rom. iv. 23, 24).—The dearer a child the sharper his discipline under the rod.—The community of sufferings which visits in the world all the brethren, is the consolation of all the children of God.—Do not vex thyself in relation to long continued sufferings; our whole life is but short.—We must regard the cross not in reference to our outward sensibilities, as being painful and afflictive to flesh and blood; but according to the salutary uses which God brings out of it (Rom. viii. 17).—Every cross has a bitter beginning, but a sweet termination —In tears lies hidden the seed of all joy and glory.—Hands and feet should, in the spiritual sense, be properly employed; the former for valiant strife, the latter for nimble running.—The stumbler must not be immediately rejected, but restored and raised up with words of comfort and admonition (Ps. lxxiii. 2; xvii. 15).

RIEGER:—Those are sure steps which are made in accordance with the course and conflict which God has ordained, with our eye on the goal of joy and glory that is set before us, and in confidence in the grace of God, accompanying us at every step.

HEUBNER:—How much less are our sufferings than the sufferings of the early Christians! Now, those who confess Christ have peace. This should shame, warn, and incite us.

FRICKE:—Every chastisement of God is, in His children, a seed, which subsequently produces fruit.

III.

Incipient apostasy must be counteracted by striving after union and sanctification.

CHAPTER XII. 14–17.

14 Follow peace with all *men* [*om. men*], and holiness, without which no man [none] shall
15 see the Lord. Looking diligently lest any man fail of [fall short of] the grace of
God; lest any root of bitterness springing up, trouble *you*, and thereby[1] [the] many
16 be defiled; Lest there *be* any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one
17 morsel of meat [one meal] sold his birthright.[2] For ye know how that [that also]
afterward, when he would have inherited [though wishing to inherit] the blessing, he
was rejected: for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully [earnestly] with tears.

[1] Ver. 15.—Instead of διὰ ταύτης, we should read after A., 17, 67**, 137, 238, δι' αὐτῆς, and instead of πολλοί, read after Sin. A., 47, οἱ πολλοί.

[2] Ver. 16.—Instead of ἀπέδοτο is found in A. C., the form ἀπέδετο, which is not an error of the copyist, but frequently occurs in the New Testament, as a specimen of forms of the later vulgar idiom. See ALEX. BUTTMANN's *Gramm. of the New Test. Idiom*, p. 41.

[Ver. 14.—*μετὰ πάντων with all*, not "*man;*" the reference is doubtless to the brethren—any further reference would here be irrelevant.—

οὗ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν κύριον
Ἐπισκοποῦντες μή τις ὑστερῶν ἀπό.

Two strictly metrical lines of Iamb. Trimeter; poetic also in diction, as οὗ χωρίς for χωρὶς οὗ or ἄνευ οὗ.

Ver. 15.—With ὑστερῶν either ᾖ is understood or (with De W., Lün., Del., Alf., we must regard it as subject of ἐνοχλῇ, and in the resumption of the sentence ῥίζα πικρίας, is put in its place. In favor, however, of the other construction is that of πόρνος, which also requires ᾖ. The passage is imitated from Deut. xxix. 18, where the Sept. ἐν χολῇ καὶ πικρια, would almost seem, and is deemed by Del., to have originated the similarly sounding ἐνοχλῇ. Still this is, on the whole, improbable, "especially as the Alexandrine copy of the Sept., which our author constantly used, has ἐνοχλῇ" (Alf.).—ῥίζα πικρίας, is evidently to be taken of *persons*, and persons inclined and tempting to apostasy.—οἱ πολλοί, not *many;* but the *many*, the *mass*.

Ver. 16.—ἀντὶ βρώσεως μιᾶς, *in exchange for one meal*.

Ver. 17.—*μετανοίας—εὗρε*. I should put this in parenthesis in entire accordance with the usage of the author. *μετανοίας* also with Del., Alf., *etc*. (against Moll, who, however, seems undecided). I would refer to Esau, not to Isaac, and the following αὐτήν to εὐλογίαν, Alford's objection to the latter, that ἐκζητήσας immediately takes up εὗρε, is by no means decisive. Ἐκζητήσας is the natural word, without any reference to the preceding εὗρεν and the μετὰ δακρύων ἐκζητήσας αὐτήν exactly describes Esau's endeavors after the blessing, as recorded in Gen.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 15. **Fall short of the grace**, *etc.*—Ὑστερεῖν ἀπό expresses the idea of free agency and of guilt (Böhme, *etc.*). With the participle ὑστερῶν either ᾖ is to be supplied as frequently in the classics after μή (Böhm., Thol., *etc.*, after the ancients), or the construction is broken, and subsequently so resumed, and completed with words from Deut. xxix. 18 after the Cod. Alex. in the Sept., that while τὶς ὑστερῶν would be properly the subject of ἐνοχλῇ, yet in place of it, on the resumption of the sentence, stands ῥίζα πικρίας (Bl., Lün., Del.). Antioch. Epiph. is called, 1 Macc. i. 19, ῥίζα πικρίας.

VER. 17. **For ye know**, *etc.*—Luth. erroneously after the Vulg. takes ἴστε imperatively, and is seriously stumbled at the general thought of the passage, inasmuch as he refers αὐτήν to μετάνοια (with Chrys., Œc., Primas., Grot., *etc.*), and refers μετάνοια to the change in the mind of *Esau*. Hence sprang grave psychological difficulties, and a seeming antagonism, with the general teachings of Scripture. To take the clause with De W. *objectively*, would require that αὐτόν, sc. τόπον, should have been written. If we adhere to the certainly natural reference of αὐτήν to μετάνοια, we must (with most intpp. since Zwingle, Bez., among them Thol., Ebr., Bisp., Lün.) understand the change of mind as applying to Jacob, not to Esau. We might, however, be tempted, on account of the special sense of μετάνοια in the N. Test., and inasmuch as Isaac has not been previously named, to refer (with Theophyl., Calv., Beng., Bl., Hofm., Del., Riehm) αὐτήν to εὐλογίαν. This yields also the unobjectionable idea that the tears shed on account of the loss of the blessing remained ineffectual, inasmuch as he found in himself no place for repentance. But in that case we must, on the one hand, take this explanatory clause, "for he found," *etc.*, as parenthetical, which is entirely foreign to the style of the author (for ch. vii. 11 and ch. xii. 20, are by no means parallel;) and on the other hand, the sentiment which thus arises is, to be sure, in accordance with ch. vi. 4-6; ch. x. 29, but not with the record of the life of Esau. The opinion of Del. that Esau is here presented as a type of that unpardonable sin of apostasy, which draws after it inevitable damnation, finds no support in the text itself. But the seeking with tears for the change of mind in his father, and the father's repelling of his entreaties, are recorded Gen. xxvii. 34-38.

[To me Moll's objections to the view which he rejects seem by no means conclusive. That the parenthesis is *not* opposed to the genius of our author's style, can be shown by several examples, as vii. 11; vii. 19; vii. 20, 21; x. 7; x. 28, in all of which a parenthesis is most naturally assumed. In the second place it seems by no means necessary to assume here that the *personal* character of Esau is in question, at least as to his ultimate repentance and individual salvation. But he held a *position* and enjoyed a prerogative of inestimable importance. As Isaac's first-born he was his natural heir, and thus naturally the inheritor of the blessings covenanted to Abraham; naturally, in the line of Theocratic descent. That prerogative he recklessly threw away. He valued so little the privilege connected with the promise and covenant of God, that he forfeited it for the single gratification of his sensual appetite. The forfeiture was fixed and fatal. When he would have recovered it he was rejected, discarded, *reprobated* (ἀπεδοκιμάσθη), and no repentance was of any avail to secure the recovery of the once discarded and abandoned blessing. Thus his example is a most happy and forcible one for the author. He stands, as suggested by Del., as the *type* of him who wantonly turns away and rejects with carnal and sensual mind the blessings of God's spiritual covenant. In his case, indeed, there is perhaps no necessity of supposing that the rejection was such as to shut him out from the kingdom of heaven. But he was inexorably excluded from the high position which he would have held as one of the line of God's covenant people, and one of the ancestors of the Messiah, and his example is a most striking and pertinent one for the purpose of our author. I believe, therefore, that αὐτήν refers to εὐλογίαν, that the clause "for he found," *etc.*, is parenthetical, and that μετάνοια refers to the change in Esau's own mind: repentance was impossible, *i. e.*, any such repentance as could restore to him the once forfeited *theocratic* blessing, and that thus the doctrine is strikingly parallel and analogous to (though not precisely identical with) the author's elsewhere repeatedly expressed doctrine of the hopelessness of the condition of the apostate.—K.].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. With a steadfast constancy in our Christian profession, there must be associated a *corresponding walk, an advancement in holiness*. Great hinderances to this arise when, along with outward afflictions, there spring up *internal divisions*, and a *spirit of contention* becomes prevalent in the Church. This is all the more in opposition to the Lord's will, by as much as we are not merely to seek to come into relations of peace with all the *brethren*, even with those of different views from our own, and to preserve and cherish these relations, but also, *so far as in us lies*, to live in peace with *all men* (Rom. xii. 18).

2. *Fellowship* with the *Lord*, and the certainty by means of this, of yet *beholding God*, should not be made dependent on external things, but we should ever bear in mind that with unspiritual modes of feeling, and with a failure in sanctification, the possession of salvation is impossible, and our claim to the inheritance is lost. To our seeing of God a fulfilment of the required conditions is indispensable, Ps. xvii. 15; xlii. 3; Matth. v. 8; 1 John iii. 2; Rev. xxii. 3, 4.

3. The *Divine fulness* of peace and holiness may and should serve as an example to the Church; but the *appropriation* of these, and *reproduction* in our own life, demands a zealous and continued *endeavor*, and a *mutual* brotherly coöperation, in order that none may so withdraw himself from grace that it can no longer influence him, or be beyond his reach.

4. The *roots of bitterness*, those poisonous plants which, springing up, disquiet and molest a Church, as the field and vineyard of God, and

bring contagion and ruin to the individuals who come in contact with them, and of whom there are but too many, are of various kinds; but preëminently dangerous is that impure and *worldly feeling* which, for the sake of fleeting charms of sense, and momentary enjoyments, half recklessly, half thoughtlessly, sacrifices the blessing of the promise, and a title to an inheritance in the kingdom of God.

5. As there are *fruitless* tears, which have no influence on the improvement and purifying of our own heart, because they stand in no connection with *actual repentance*, so there are also tears shed *too late*, and therefore *in vain*, which are of no avail to change the purposes of others, and have no power to modify the lot which a person has previously chosen for himself. A *repentance*, however, sought *sincerely and earnestly*, and yet in vain, is, according to the tenor of Scripture, as completely unsupposable as is a truly penitent and yet ineffectual seeking of *the grace of God* for the forgiveness of sin within the limits of our temporal life.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Better *seasonably preserve* a good than *mourn* for it when too late.—They who most zealously strive for their *own sanctification*, care most earnestly for the *salvation of others*.—He who is intent on *seeing God* must be in earnest in securing sanctification.—From what source the pursuit of peace derives its *power*, and wherein it finds its *limits*.

STARKE:—It is lovely and beautiful to live in peace with all men, so far as it can be done with a good conscience. Yet if we cannot always be at peace, still we must never give occasion for quarrelling and strife (Ps. cxxxiii. 1; 1 Cor. xi. 16).—Great wisdom and careful keeping of our conscience are required, that we may neither from fear of men omit in our works or suppress in our words any thing which ought to be done and spoken, and that in neither do we say any thing which may breed dissension, and which either had better been entirely omitted, or might have been done or uttered in a better manner (Prov. xiii. 10).—He who will not be born anew with Christ, to him His birth is of no avail. He who will not die to sin with Christ, to him His death is of no avail. He who will not rise from sin in Christ, His resurrection is of no avail (Acts iii. 26; Col. iii. 1; Jno. iii. 3, 5; 1 Pet. ii. 24).—If hatred has sprung from wrath, and the hatred continues until the sun has repeatedly set upon it, the seated hatred roots itself in the heart, and becomes a noxious plant not easily eradicated. —A Christian should be watchful over his fellow, that he may exhort him to that which is good.— There are in the Holy Scripture bad and good examples, which prove that the devil has for a long time carried on his wickedness, and that we must not indiscriminately appeal to ancient examples (1 Cor. xi. 1).—Oh, how many brethren of Esau are abroad in the world, who sell for temporal pleasures the prerogative of their birthright, the kingdom of heaven! Woe to those who follow after them (2 Tim. iii. 4).

RIEGER:—We think that we are in the right, and that we are seeking nothing but the right; but we seek it in such a way that love, peace, compassion, are sacrificed in the pursuit, and we defile our spirits with many a stain, in which we also involve many others. He who cannot be induced to carefulness in regard to apparently small matters, will never be in genuine earnest. A mess of pottage could do Esau so much harm!— A cup of cold water may receive a reward.—To will while God wills, and awakens our own will, this effects good. To will, when grace and the season of grace have been neglected, and the door has been shut, will be in vain, and will prove no small part of one's eternal shame and suffering (Matth. vii. 22, 23; Luke xiii. 25).

HAHN:—A single act can work great ruin. Much is often lost in a brief space; for the sake of a small thing we often surrender that which is great. The false hope of its recovery we see in the example of Esau.

HEUBNER:—Peace would seem not to be sinful neglect, but connected with a strict adherence to the will of God.—The reward of Christian sanctification is glorious. It is the necessary condition of blessedness.—By deferring our reformation, Divine grace is often trifled away.—It is a duty to keep the Church pure, and to guard against the influence of seducers; the whole Church is defiled, dishonored and poisoned.— How miserable is the reward bestowed by sin, and how infinitely great the loss of the sinner. —Though those who come to late repentance may obtain indeed a Seir, yet it is not Canaan.

AHLFELD:—In sanctification the Holy Spirit transforms us into the image of Christ: 1. Why should we be in earnest in regard to this sanctification? 2. Whence do we acquire the power to attain it? 3. Wherein do we perceive that we grow in it? 4. What is its goal and termination?

MENKEN:—The grace of God and the sanctification of our own nature, peace with God and with ourselves, and the love of peace, and a peaceful tone of feeling and of conduct *in our relation with others*, stand in indissoluble connection, and in the degree in which we are participant in the first, will the other also be found with us.

IV.

We are held under obligation to this by the nature of the New Covenant.

CHAPTER XII. 18–24.

18 For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched [to a mountain[1] that
is handled], and that burned with fire [and to burning fire], nor [and] unto blackness,
19 and darkness,[2] and tempest, And [to] the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words,
which *voice* [*om. voice*] they that heard entreated [deprecatingly begged, *παρῃτήσαντο*,
that the word should not be spoken to them any more [that (further) speech might not
20 be added to them]: (For they could not endure [endured not] that which was [*om.* was]
commanded, And if so much as [Even if] a beast touch the mountain, it shall be
21 stoned, or thrust through with a dart [*om.* or thrust through with a dart[3]]: And so
terrible was the sight, *that* [And—so fearful was the spectacle—] Moses said, I ex-
22 ceedingly fear and quake). But ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city
of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels,
23 To the general assembly and church of the first-born [and to myriads, a festal company
of angels and the congregation of the first-born], which are written [who are registered]
in heaven, and to God, the Judge of all [*or*, and as Judge, to the God of all], and to
the spirits of just men made perfect, And to Jesus the mediator of the [a] new cove-
24 nant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than *that* of [more
mightily[4] than] Abel.

[1] Ver. 18.—Even Tisch. has (in *Edd. II., IV., VII.*) replaced in the text the indispensable ὄρει after ψηλαφ., following D. K. L. and nearly all the minusc., although it is wanting in Sin. A.C., 14, 17, and many ancient translations, and hence is suspected by Mill as a gloss, and rejected by Lachm., Tisch. I., and Alford. [With Tisch., Moll, *etc.*, I should retain it, regarding this as a case (like Ἔχομεν, Rom. v. 1) in which the internal evidence overbalances stronger external testimony on the other side.—K.].

[2] Ver. 18.—Instead of *καὶ σκότῳ* read, after Sin. A. C. D., 17, 31, 39, the more rare and elegant *τῷ ζόφῳ*. The former comes from Deut. iv. 11; v. 22, and is added in Sin. by the corrector.

[3] [Ver. 20.—The clause *ἢ βολίδι κατατοξ.* of the Rec. (but inserted after *καὶ οὕτως*, ver. 21), is as deficient in authority as it is injurious to the rhetoric of the passage, and is rejected as an interpolation by all the best editors.—K.].

[4] Ver. 24.—Instead of *κρείττονα*, the uncials uniformly, and the minusc. generally read *κρεῖττον*.

[Ver. 18.—*ψηλαφωμένῳ*, scil., *ὄρει*, *to a mountain that is felt of*, handled, palpable to touch—material and earthly.—*καὶ κεκαυμένῳ πυρί*, *and to kindled*, hence, *burning fire*, better than *burning with fire*.

Ver. 19.—*παρῃτήσαντο, etc.*, *begged off against any further word being said to them*; *παραιτεῖσθαι*, *to beg off for oneself. to deprecate*, not—*αἰτεῖσθαι παρά τινος* (as Alf.), but *παρά*, with force of *aside from, against*.

Ver. 20.—*οὐκ ἔφερον τὸ διαστελλόμενον*, *they did not bear that which commanded*—the command.

Ver. 21.—*καί—οὕτως*. So, perhaps, it is better to punctuate, carrying *καί* over to *τὸ φανταζ.*, as otherwise a *ὅτι*, or *ὥς* with *φανταζ.*, could hardly be dispensed with.

Ver. 22, 23.—*μυριάσιν ἀγγέλ. πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ*. The Eng. ver., *an innumerable company of angels and the general assembly and church, etc.*, is rendered impossible by the absence of the conjunction before *πανηγ.* while again to connect *πανηγ.* with *ἐκκλησίᾳ* without the *καί*, involves an unaccountable departure from the general structure of the passage, in which all the other principal members are connected by *καί*. It remains then either to take *μυριάσιν* as a collective term distributed into the *πανήγυρις* of angels, and the *ἐκκλησία* of the first-born, or to take *μυριάσιν* as belonging only to the clause *ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει* in which case again it is a question whether we are to read, "to myriads, a festal company of angels," or, "to myriads of angels, a festal company." In regard to the first construction, *μυριάσιν* is justly remarked by Moll to be naturally suggestive, from Old Testament associations, of angels, and it seems better so to restrict it. Thus restricted again, if *μυριάσιν* governs *ἀγγέλ.* the noun *πανηγ.* comes in as a dragging and halting apposition. With Moll, I prefer, therefore, "to myriads," *viz.*, a festal host of angels. If (with Alf., *etc.*) *μυριάσιν* covered both *πανηγ.* and *ἐκκλησ.*, so elegant a writer would hardly have omitted *τε* after *ἀγγέλων*.—*πανήγυρις*, not merely *a general assembly*, but, *a festal gathering, a joyful and jubilant host*.—*ἐκκλησ. πρωτο.*, perhaps better rendered by the indefinite art., "a congregation of first-born ones," suggested by the case of Esau, who had to *lose* his birthright in order that Jacob might obtain it.—*ἀπογεγ. ἐν οὐρ*, *registered.*, *enrolled*, whose citizenship is *in heaven*.—*καὶ κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων*, *and to God the judge of all*, so E. V., *etc.*, and still Alf., while among others De Wette, Bleek, Lün., Del. and Moll construct: "*and as judge to the God of all*," which certainly has the order of the words, and I think the sentiment in its favor.

Ver. 24.—*διαθ. νέας*, *of a new covenant*.—*κρεῖττον λαλοῦντι*, *speaking better*, or, *more mightily*.—*παρὰ τὸν Ἄβελ*, *in comparison with Abel*.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 18. **Which is handled.**—The pres. particip. can be scarcely regarded as=the verbal adjective in *τος*, hence *ψηλαφώμενος* is not=*which might be touched*, as is commonly maintained, nor=touched by God, *i. e.*, by the lightning, and therefore, smoking (Beng., Storr, and others); but it expresses that which, in its nature, is material and perceptible to the sense. The position of *ὄρει* is opposed to the construction which would connect *κεκαυμένῳ* with it, and make *πυρί* dat. of the instrument (Bl., De W., Thol., Lun., *etc.*), with reference to Deut. v. 23; ix. 15, *etc.* Del. also remarks, in defence of the

coördinate construction of these words adopted by Erasm., Calv., Beza, Grot., Beng., *etc.*, that also at Deut. iv. 36; and elsewhere "the great fire" is mentioned by itself. Σαλπίγγος ἤχῳ is borrowed from Ex. xix. 16; φωνῇ ῥημάτων from Deut. iv. 12; the relative clause ἧς, *etc.*, refers to Deut. v. 22; xviii. 16; comp. Ex. xx. 18 ff.; the command, ver. 20, refers to Ex. xix. 12 ff. To understand τὸ διαστελλόμενον as=that which is ordained (Storr, Schultz, *etc.*), is contrary to the New Testament usage, which employs the verb only as a middle.

VER. 21. **And—so fearful,** *etc.*—The proper punctuation originated with Beza. Previously, καὶ οὕτως were always taken together. Ver. 21 is a heightening of the idea of 8–20; but the καί is not=*also*, or *even* (Carpz., Boehm., and others). This interpretation is inconsistent with its position in the clause. The words here ascribed to Moses are not found in the Scripture account of the giving of the Law. According to Calov, the author drew from immediate inspiration. According to Erasm., Beza, Schlicht., and others, from tradition. Recent commentators more correctly refer the words to Deut. ix. 19, where Moses expresses his fear of the wrath of God, after the defection of the people in worshipping the golden calf, by the words καὶ ἔκφοβός εἰμι. Stephen, at Acts vii. 32, in recounting the appearance of God in the burning bush, represents Moses as ἔντρομος γενόμενος, which words, also, are not found at Ex. iii. 6.

VER. 22. **To Mount Zion, and to the city of the living God, the Heavenly Jerusalem.**—With Mount Sinai, the representative of the legislation of the Old Covenant (Gal. iv. 24), is contrasted Mt. Zion as the city of the fulfilled Messianic promises (Ps. xlviii. 3; l. 2; lxxviii. 68; cx. 2; cxxxii. 13; Is. ii. 2; Micah iv. 1; Joel iii. 5; Obadiah 17; Rev. iv. 1), and as the true dwelling-place of God (Micah xiv. 8; Isa. xxvi. 21; Ezek. iii. 12). So also the Heavenly Jerusalem, which (Gal. iv. 26) is also mentioned as Mother of the redeemed and truly free children of God, is contrasted with the earthly Jerusalem, the city of the great King (Matt. v. 35), as the city in which the living God, who is also its Founder and Architect (ch. xi. 10, 16), has not so much His dwelling-place as His people. That the contrast of the earthly and the heavenly is here arranged according to the sacred number seven (Beng., Del., Kluge), is not indicated in the text.

Myriads, *etc.*—By the term "myriads," we are involuntarily reminded of angels (Deut. xxxiii. 2; Dan. vii. 10; Judg. xiv). It is therefore very natural to regard angels also here as exclusively meant, and to take the term not as a *collective* conception, distributing itself into the two parts of a festal assemblage of angels, and the congregation of the first-born (as with Beng., Bl., De W., Ebr., Del., *etc.*). It is, indeed, in my judgment, most natural to conceive the angelic hosts "as a festal company" (Cant. vii. 1), yet, as in apposition with 'myriads;' to which there is then subjoined the mention of the Christian church. For inasmuch as the term "myriads" does not of necessity, under all circumstances, denote angels, Num. x. 36, it would be almost indispensable to add some specializing clause. Should we, on the contrary, connect ἀγγέλων not with πανηγύρει (Seb. Schmidt, Griesb., Knapp, *etc.*), but with μυριάσιν (Bez., Calov, Storr, Thol., Lün., *etc.*), we must, in that case, either take πανηγ. as in opposition with μυριάσιν, which would be dragging and heavy, or connect it with the following, giving it quite another reference. Thol. makes, alongside of the 'myriads of angels,' a 'festal company' of glorified saints, who are already celebrating the Sabbath of the people of God (ch. iv. 19), and the community of Christians still walking upon the earth. To these latter the ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων certainly has reference, inasmuch as they are said to be "registered or enrolled in heaven;" because by the introduction of their names into the book of life, they are registered as citizens of the kingdom of heaven, with an assured prospect of the heavenly inheritance, (Dan. xii. 1; Luke x. 20; Phil. iv. 8; Rev. iii. 5; xiii. 8; xx. 15); and they are called "First-born," not in reference to the *time* of their conversion, whether understood of *Apostles* (Primas., Grot.), or of the earliest *Jewish and Gentile believers* (Schlicht., Bl., Ebr., *etc.*), or of those who have been glorified by *martyrdom* (De W.); but in reference to their *dignity* as "first-fruits of the creatures of God" (ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κτισμάτων τοῦ θεοῦ), James i. 18, Rev. xiv. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 13 (Böhm., Thol., *etc.*). [May there not be a reference in the term πρωτότοκος, here to the case of Esau, a little above alluded to, who sold his birth-right, πρωτοτόκια, and whose selling or parting with it was indispensable to its passing over to Jacob? In earthly families and relationships there can be but *one* first-born; the prerogative is restricted by the nature of the case. But in the family of God they are *all* 'first-born.' The congregation of ancient Israel was made up in but a small proportion of those who held this honor; but the spiritual church of the New Testament is a "community or congregation of First-born ones" —they are *all* first-born. This need not exclude the reference to the import of the term as given by the author.—K.]. The term ἀπογεγρ. forbids our referring the "first-born," either to those already dwelling in heaven, or to angels, as the oldest inhabitants of heaven (Nöss., Storr, *etc.*), or to the patriarchs and saints of the Old Testament (Calv., Beng., Lün., *etc.*), or to the glorified first fruits of Christianity (De W.); for the sealing borne by the 144,000, as their characteristic mark on the heavenly Zion (Rev. xiv. 1), and which had been already impressed upon them on the earth (ch. vii. 8), is an entirely different thing from the registering of their names in the list of the citizens of the kingdom of heaven. But it is very questionable whether we are authorized to refer πανηγ. to the festal company of the *glorified*, as such a reference is in no way exegetically involved in the text. It were much more natural in such a coördination of πανηγύρει and ἐκκλησίᾳ in reference to the πρωτότοκοι, not, indeed, to adopt the view of Lün., that the collective community of the first-born are characterized partly as a festal and exulting assemblage (πανηγ.); partly as bound in an inward unity (ἐκκλησ.), but rather that of Hofmann, who finds in it the united and kindred designations of the church, partly as a *religious* and

worshiping, partly as a *political* organization. But there is absolutely no ground apparent for this double representation; on the contrary, the absence in this case of the connecting particle καί between the two principal members would be entirely inexplicable.

VER. 23. **As Judge, to the God of all**, *etc.*—[So Moll with many, instead of "to God, the Judge of all"]. We need absolutely assume no inversion (with the old translators and interpreters). The subject is the *prerogatives of the Christian revelation;* hence in regard to the Judge before whom the first-born, who are enrolled for the kingdom of heaven, *i. e.*, Christians, are yet to appear, the comforting declaration is made that He is the *God of all; i. e.*, stands in a positive religious relation to all the members of this community. This explanation is suggested by the context, and is entirely satisfactory. It makes also a natural connection with what follows. To take πάντων as neuter, thus designating the Judge who protects His people by His judgment, in His omnipotence as God over all beings and things (Del.) is totally unnecessary, and, in fact, would require ἐπί with πάντων. It is equally erroneous to find in the passage a reference to the narrow and bigoted conceptions of the Jews (Bl., De W., Lün.).

Spirits of the just made perfect.—By virtue of their religious communion with God the Christians, while yet living, stand in the same political fellowship to which the departed spirits of the righteous belong, not barely those of the Old Covenant (Schlicht., Bl., De W., Ebr., *etc.*), nor merely those of the New (Grot., Beng., Storr, Lün., *etc.*), but of both (Böhme, Thol., Bisp., Del., Riehm, Alf.). They are called τετελειωμένοι, not because they have completed their earthly life (Calv., Limb., Böhme, *etc.*), and not in the sense of τέλειοι, *perfect ones* (Theophyl., Luth., *etc.*), but because Christ has brought them to the goal of perfection. For although they have not yet experienced the resurrection, and that ultimate perfection (τελείωσις) which is common to all the believers of the Old and the New Testament, still awaits them (ch. xi. 40), yet Christ who *descended* and *ascended*, Eph. iv. 10, has already opened to them the gates of the realm of death (Rev. i. 18). Even before the resurrection they have been permitted to enjoy the presence of the Lord (Phil. i. 23; compare John xiv. 2).

VER. 24. **Jesus, mediator of a new covenant.**—The writer selects the personal historical name of the Mediator, because by the death of the Incarnate One upon the cross, that covenant was effected which (ch. viii. 8, 13; ix. 15) was called καινή, as being new in its quality (*fœdus novum*), but is here called νεά which Böhme, Kuin., and others here without ground regard as identical in meaning, but which rather characterizes this covenant as *recent*, as new in time and fraught with youthful vigor.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The legislation of Mount Sinai has a threatening, and even fearful character, which brings out in strong relief the *majesty* of the God, who, by His *voice* indeed reveals Himself on earth, but *remains Himself* invisible; and in view of it fills sinful man with terror in the feeling that he stands exposed to the avenging lightnings of this Heavenly King, and has nothing to oppose to the thunders of His speech; so that, instead of rejoicing in the presence of God, he would rather flee from the stormy terrors of His approach, unless restrained by the hand and mandate of the Almighty. This fearful shuddering before God was felt even by the *Mediator* of God's revelation to the world, inasmuch as He was only a man who Himself stood in need of a reconciling mediator. Although there existed an *earthly* place for the revelation of God, yet God still remained Himself *unapproachable*, and the *natural phenomena* in which He announced His presence, and indicated the character of His revelation for the time being, at the same time *veiled* His real essence. In accordance with this, the character of God's Old Covenant people is only that of an *external* holiness and union with God, which expresses, and represents that which *should* be, but is unable to obtain and impart it.

2. Christians, on the contrary, are the *true people of God*, endowed with a *citizenship* in heaven, and with all the *means of grace* on earth, so that in their pilgrimage below, they are not merely blest with heavenly goods, but are *transformed into the heavenly character*, (Eph. ii. 6), and have their citizenship (πολίτευμα) in heaven (Phil. iii. 20), with whose *inhabitants* they now already, as belonging to the kingdom of God, have fellowship, and their approach to which, as members of the *New Covenant*, is rendered possible by the *blood of its Mediator*, which brings them who are *sprinkled* with it into a *gracious relation* to the *Judge*, and which, as the blood of the Righteous One, who, in the power of an indestructible life, stands completely and forever in our stead, powerfully surpasses the cry of Abel for vengeance, who, murdered in his innocence, is not forgotten of God (ch. xi. 4).

3. The mention of the "spirits of the just made perfect," argues decisively alike against the assumption of a *sleep of the souls* of the departed, and against the doctrine of a purgatory.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

By what means we ascertain that the *Mediator* of the Old Covenant revelation was not the *genuine* Mediator.—The diversity of the *voice of God* in the Law and in the Gospel.—By our entrance into the *Christian Church* we come into *communion* with a *heavenly world*.—That which most *terrifies* us, most powerfully *consoles*, most tenderly *allures*.—Our connection with heaven, prepares us on *earth* to triumph over the *world*.

STARKE:—The glory of the New Covenant pledges all who live in it to the greater sanctity.—The law of the Most High is no child's play; it commands and threatens. If we are unable to fulfil it, we must still fear in holy reverence, and seek protection with Him who has fulfilled it on our behalf.—Here on earth believers are really blessed and they pass in their blessed state of grace from one degree of blessedness to another.—See, we are to be citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem, associates with Christ, with the holy angels and the elect.—By faith, Christ dwells

in our hearts; we have Him and enjoy Him; but in heaven we shall properly see Him, possess Him, and be satisfied.

HAHN:—We are, as it were, so loaded down with grace, that it were the greatest ingratitude and insensibility if this did not spur us on.—The fact that a part of His people are still in a distant land, and some are already at home, is matter of no account with the Lord Jesus, and occasions Him no concern; for, in His own time, He will bring us all thither.—We have, in the Spirit, perpetual access on high, and perpetual enjoyment from on high.

HEUBNER:—The Church of Christ on earth is a nursery for the Church of Christ in heaven.—The Christian alone has the hope of a blessed communion with all saints.

THOLUCK:—The greater the grace which is evinced toward us, the heavier our responsibility, if we refuse to heed it.

APPUHN:—The children of God on earth and the children of God in heaven, are intimately united.

HEDINGER:—Grace, not wrath, is to quicken our obedience.—The fairer the city, the more cheerful and glad the service of its citizens.

V.

The guilt and punishableness of apostasy stand proportionate to the blessings and obligations of the New Covenant.

CHAPTER XII. 25–29.

25 See that ye refuse not him that speaketh: for if they escaped not who refused
him that spake [was uttering his oracles, *χρηματίζοντα*] on earth, much[1] more *shall*
26 *not* we *escape*, if we turn away from him that *speaketh* from heaven: Whose
voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more I[2]
27 shake not the earth only, but also heaven. And this *word*, Yet once more,
signifieth the removal of those things that are [being] shaken, as of things that
are made [as having been made], that those things which cannot be shaken [which
28 are not shaken] may remain. Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be
moved [not to be shaken], let us have grace [cherish gratitude][3] whereby we may [let
us] serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear [with devout reverence and
29 fear]:[4] For [also] our God *is* a consuming fire.

[1] Ver. 25.—According to the best authorities we are to read ἐξέφυγον ἐπὶ γῆς παραιτησάμενοι τὸν χρηματίζοντα, πολὺ μᾶλλον. So also Sin.

[2] Ver. 26.—Instead of σείω read σείσω, after Sin. A. C., 6, 47, 53.

[3] Ver. 28.—The *lect. rec.* ἔχωμεν is supported by A. C. D. L. M., *etc.* So also the reading λατρεύωμεν. Sin. has in both cases the Indic.

[4] Ver. 28.—Instead of μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ εὐλαβείας read μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους, after Sin. A. C. D*., 17, 71, 73, 80, 137.

[Ver. 25.—μὴ παραιτήσησθε, *lest ye beg off from*, decline, refuse; a verbal correspondence with παραιτήσ., ver. 19, which it is difficult to reproduce in English.—τὸν λαλοῦντα, *him who is speaking*, *viz.*, God through Christ, as anciently through Moses.—παραιτησάμενοι, *after refusing*, or more exactly, *when they refused*. The Part. is not part of the subject, but is added predicatively to ἐκεῖνοι, or subject.—τὸν χρηματίζοντα, *who was uttering heavenly oracles, declaring the divine will*, not *speaking* as if=λαλοῦντα or λέγοντα—τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, *him* (*who speaketh*) from heaven—again *God*, speaking through Christ.

Ver. 26.—νῦν δέ, seemingly *temporal*, and in part so, as contrasted with τότε: but in my judgment still more decidedly *logical—in the present state of things, as the case actually stands.*—ἔτι ἅπαξ, *yet once*, and once only.

Ver. 27.—τῶν σαλευ. *of the things which are being shaken.*—ὡς πεποιημένων, *as having been made.*—Ἵνα, I connect not (with Bol., Moll, *etc.*) with πεποιημένων, but with μετάθεσιν, and hence put a comma after πεποιη.

Ver. 28.—βασιλ. ἀσάλευτον, *a kingdom not to be shaken*—"which cannot be *moved*," of E. V., destroys the paronomasia.—ἔχωμεν χάριν, according to Greek usage, not, *let us have grace*, but, "*let us exercise gratitude.*"—μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους; 'with reverent submission and fear" (ALF.).

Ver. 29.—καὶ γάρ, *for also*, not "for even," which would require ὁ ἡμέτερος, or a more emphatic position of ἡμῶν.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 25. **Him who is speaking**, *etc.*—Inasmuch as the ἐπὶ γῆς χρηματίζων must be not Moses, but *God;* inasmuch, too, as the words τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν, sc. χρηματίζοντα can in like manner, as shown by the following οὗ, denote God alone, but the words just mentioned stand parallel with τὸν λαλοῦντα in the beginning of ver. 25, by the "speaker" here referred to must be understood, not Christ (Œc., Primas., Böhm., Ebr., *etc.*), but *God*. The emphasis is not laid on the diversity of the *persons* whom God employed in founding the Old and the New Covenant, but on the diversity in the *modes of revealing* one and the same God. "The Sinaitic revelation, belonging to the past, and the ever present and continued re-

relations to the Church of Christ, are placed in contrast with each other. At that time, He who was speaking to Israel had descended to earth; but He through whom God speaks to us is He who hath ascended to heaven" (Hofm., Del., in part, Bl.). Thus vanishes the *imperfect* antithesis censured by De W., produced by referring the speaking on earth to the earthly ministry of Christ, and then, with Thol., laying the emphasis on the fact that Christ had descended from heaven, that is, had not appeared among mankind in the ordinary and natural way; or, with Lün., upon the fact that God had sent to us not an earthly man, as Moses upon Sinai, but His own Son, as His interpreter. For it might then be objected that the Son of God has appeared "upon earth," but that God upon Sinai, without descending into the midst of Israel, had spoken "from heaven" (Ex. xx. 22; Deut. ix. 13). The true explanation preserves and renders consistent the connection of the thought with the above mentioned blood of sprinkling.

VER. 26. **But now hath he promised.**—The subject of ἐπήγγελται is contained in the preceding οὗ, and the whole sentence has sprung grammatically from blending into one two declarations; for the νῦν. δέ refers to the time of the incipient fulfilment of that which God has announced, Hagg. ii. 6 ff. Ἐπήγγελται is Perf. Pass. in a middle sense, as ch. iv. 21.

VER. 27. **Yet once for all.**—The first shaking took place at the giving of the Law (Ex. xix. 18), where, however, the Sept. translates λαός instead of ὄρος, for which reason our author refers doubtless to Judg. v. 4, 5; comp. Ps. lxviii. 9; cxiv. 7. A like display of Jehovah's power is predicted by the prophets for the closing Messianic epoch, Mic. vii. 15; Hab. iii.; Hagg. ii. The author follows the defective translation of the Sept. In the original it is said, "Yet one thing; it is a small matter." This expansion of the time from Hos. i. 4 implies, according to Hitz. and Hofm., two things; namely, that the time from the present until the final grand consummation will constitute but one epoch, and that this will be a brief one. Thus the argument from the "yet once for all" (ἔτι ἅπαξ) is sound as to the matter of fact, although in *form* it attaches itself to a false rendering.

As having been made, *etc.*—Alike the expression, ὡς πεποιμένων, and the final clause following that, show that the shaking refers not to any convulsion accompanying the entrance of Christianity into the world (Coccei., a Lapid., Böhm., Klee, *etc.*), but to the final consummation (Theodoret, Theoph., Erasm., Bez., Bl., Thol., *etc.*). Even at the creation God intended and prepared for the last and now commencing transformation of the changeable into the unchangeable, of what may be shaken into what cannot be shaken (Rom. viii. 21), or (as is said, ch. iv. 4-9), for the sabbatism of the world. On account of this parallel with which Col. i. 16; Eph. i. 10 substantially coincide, the reference of the final clause with ἵνα to μετάθεσιν (Theod., Œc., Bl., De W., Lün., *etc.*) is quite improbable, and all the more so in that also the new heaven and the new earth are said to be *created* and *made*, Is. lxv. 17; lxvi. 22. In connecting ἵνα with ὡς πεποιημένων it is better with Grot., Beng., Thol., Hofm., Del., *etc.*, to take μένειν in its usual signification, which has the authority of Is. lxvi. 21, than in that of *waiting for something* (Storr, Böhm., *etc.*), which occurs Acts xx. 5, 23, and frequently in the Sept.

[Alford rejects, and I think with entire correctness, the reference of the final clause to πεποιημένων, and retains the much more rational and entirely unobjectionable view that it is to be connected with μετάθεσιν. The characterization of "the things that are shaken" as "having been made in order that the things which are not shaken may remain," to wit, by the removal of things which are shaken, is so forced and unnatural that nothing but necessity can justify our adopting this construction. On the other hand, its construction with μετάθεσιν seems to me open to no valid objection whatever. For, in the first place, although there is no strict logical causative connection between the *removal* of the things that are shaken and the *remaining* of the things that are not shaken, yet, as a popular form of expression, it is entirely natural. The changeable and temporary is *easily conceived* as being taken out of the way in order to give permanent place to the immutable and abiding. In the second place, the objection to taking τῶν πεποιημένων absolutely, as denoting simply things which have been *made, i. e.*, created, drawn from the fact that the abiding and eternal, *viz.*, the *new heavens* and the *new earth* are also represented as having been *made*, rests, I think, upon an entire misconception of the author's point of view. He says nothing about "a new heaven and a new earth," and there is no evidence that these specific things are in his mind. It is rather the great heavenly, spiritual elements of the new dispensation, as against the worldly, material, and perishable elements of the old. It is Mt. Zion as opposed to Mt. Sinai; the heavenly Jerusalem as opposed to the literal seat of the Old Theocracy; the heavenly sanctuary as against the earthly—and in short, the whole spiritual system of the New Testament, as against the things that have been *made*. The term τῶν πεποιημ. is therefore, from the author's point of view, a precise and admirable characterization of the *created* and therefore *perishable* nature of the Old Test. economy.—K.]

VER. 28. **Therefore since we,** *etc.*—Διὸ introduces the following exhortation as a logical reference from the preceding verse, the special ground of the exhortation being given in the participial clause (Dan. vii. 18). The absence of the article with βασιλείαν indicates that this clause is not, with Calv., Schlicht., Beng. and others, to be included in the exhortation itself. Nor may we, with Bez., Schlicht., Grot., Bisp., *etc.*, render, "Let us hold fast the grace." For then the article would be indispensable with χάριν, and, instead of ἔχωμεν, κατέχωμεν would be required (as ch. iii. 6, 14; x. 23); or κρατῶμεν, as ch. iv. 14.

VER. 29. **For also our God,** *etc.*—Were the idea intended that our God also, the God of the New Test., as well as the God of the Old, is a consuming fire (Bl., De W., Thol., Bisp.), the reading should be καὶ γὰρ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός. Yet neither again do the position of the words and the connection point to the thought that God is

not merely a God of grace, but also of avenging justice (Lün.). The passage merely designs to give, with a reference to Deut. iv. 24, *a feature of the Divine character*, and is not intended merely to give prominence to one attribute in comparison with another. Under this view, καὶ γάρ is= *etenim*, as Luke i. 66; xx. 37 (Del., Riehm).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. We can refuse to *receive* and to *follow* that which God says to us; but we can escape neither the *responsibility* for such conduct, nor the *judgment* of God regarding it.

2. Our responsibility is rendered all the greater by the increased elevation and fulness of grace which characterize the revelation of God in the New Testament, a revelation standing related to that of the Old Testament, as heaven to earth.

3. This Christian revelation is at the same time *the final and the complete one*, so that nothing farther is to be looked for but the *last* convulsion of all things, which, at the second coming of the Lord, shall transform heaven and earth.

4. At the very *creation* of the world, God looked forward to, and made arrangements for the eternally abiding and unchangeable *kingdom of glory*, and to the introduction of that kingdom tend all the revelations, arrangements, and providences of God in the history of the world.

5. This everlasting kingdom shall we Christians as children of God, and joint heirs with Jesus Christ (Rom. viii. 17), *receive into possession:* for this we owe a debt of *gratitude* to God, which should evince itself in a *service well pleasing* to Him, which yields for us the highest gain, and has the richest promise (Ps. l. 23.)

6. This filial relation to God must beget neither an unbecoming familiarity, nor a false security, but must inspire a guarded caution and reverence such as belongs to the nature of God in which the fire of holy love consumes all that is unholy, and kindles to a flame all that is susceptible of life.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

God speaks with us; then He *seeks* us in His word; afterwards He *judges* us.—Every revelation of God is accompanied with great *convulsions*, and by movements in *heaven* and on *earth*. How stands our heart in relation thereto?—We can neither plead *ignorance* nor *inability* if we fail to escape the coming wrath.—The rejection of the highest *grace*, draws after it the heaviest *punishment*.—However different is the old covenant from the new, it is one God who *speaks*, *judges*, and *saves*, in both.—The world, however powerful and great it may be, cannot *shield* us against the wrath of God, and cannot *rob* us of the kingdom of God; but it can *bring down* upon us the one, and *defraud* us of the other.—The kingdom of *nature* is destined, through the kingdom of *grace*, to be transformed and exalted into the kingdom of *glory*.—The kingdom of God is the *object of the creation;* revelation is the *means* of its accomplishment.

STARKE:—In the duty of serving through the grace of God, of pleasing Him with reverence and fear, lies a beautiful connection of Law and Gospel.—Believers receive the kingdom, not as mere subjects, but as partners in sovereignty, who are jointly exalted to the throne of Christ, (Rev. i. 16; iii. 21; v. 9 ff.), by virtue of their royal priesthood (1 Pet. ii. 9).—Alas! the world sins against the commands of God as securely as if there were no avenger; nay, it even makes a mock at sin. But God is a consuming fire (Ps. ii. 11, 12).

RIEGER:—God is without end in the gift, the Lord Jesus without end in the allotment, and we without end in the reception of the immovable kingdom; and thus we mount above everything which is subject to change.

HEUBNER:—The glory of Christianity lays us under obligation for the highest gratitude.

HEDINGER:—Compulsory love is not the best. But the obligation to be godly is great; of this be not forgetful.

CONCLUSION OF THE EPISTLE.

A.

Moral exhortations of a more general character.

CHAPTER XIII. 1–6.

1, 2 Let brotherly love continue. Be not forgetful to entertain strangers: for thereby
3 some have entertained angels unawares. Remember them that are in bonds, as bound
with them; *and* [*om. and*] them which suffer adversity, as being yourselves also in
4 the body. Marriage *is* honourable in all [Be marriage held in honor in all things], and
the [be its] bed undefiled: but [*or* for][1] whoremongers and adulterers God will judge.
5 *Let your* conversation [disposition, or mode of life] *be* without covetousness; *and be*
[being] content with such things as ye have: for he [himself] hath said, I will never

6 [by no means] leave thee, nor [will I at all] forsake thee. So that we may boldly [with confidence] say, The Lord *is* my helper, and I will not fear what man shall do unto me [I will not fear; what shall a man do unto me?].

1 Ver. 4.—The particle δέ is found in C. D***. J. K.; on the contrary, γάρ in Sin. A. D*. M. The Pesh. follows the former reading; the It. and Vulg. the latter. [Tisch., Del., Moll retain δέ. Alf. substitutes γάρ.—K.].

[Ver. 2.—τὴν φιλοξενίαν, *hospitality.*—διὰ ταύτης, *by means of this.*—ἔλαθον ξενίσ., *escaped notice entertaining—entertained unawares;* the Aor. pointing back historically to the time of the event.

Ver. 3.—Is more forcible with the asyndeton of the original; the *and* is unnecessary and enfeebling.—τῶν κακουχουμένων, *those in distress.*

Ver. 4.—The Imperat. is (with Moll, Del., Alf., *etc.*) much better than the Ind. construction of the Eng. ver. We might hesitate to supply the Imperat.. rather than the Indic., but we must do so in ver. 5, and there is no difficulty here, because the imperative idea which belongs to all the preceding clauses, would naturally be transferred to this, in the absence of the verb.—Ἐν πᾶσιν, *in all things;* with *persons*, παρὰ πᾶσιν, would be more natural (Moll, Alf.).

Ver. 5.—ὁ τρόπος, *habit, disposition;* Moll: *Sinnesart;* Alf.: *mode of life.*—ἀρκούμενοι τοῖς παροῦσιν, *being contented, with what ye have.*—αὐτὸς γάρ, *for he himself.*—οὐ μή σε ἀνῶ, οὐδ᾽ οὐ μή σε, *etc.*, much more emphatic than the construction of the Eng. ver., "I will by no means leave thee, nor will I by any means abandon thee."

Ver. 6.—θαρροῦντας, *with confidence.*—καὶ οὐ φοβηθήσομαι: Sin. follows Vulg., *etc.*, in omitting καί; Alf., Del., Moll *etc.*, retain it. But all agree in reading the following clause, as an independent question, τί ποιήσ., *etc.*, *what will a man do unto me?*

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 1. **Continue.**—The *form* of the injunction shows that the brotherly love, once so prevalent in the church, *i. e.*, the mutual love of Christians, must, at the time of the composition of our Epistle, have still been active in it, as indicated also at ch. vi. 10; x. 32 ff.; while ch. x. 26 shows the necessity of their being exhorted to the practice of this virtue. This brotherly love φιλαδελφία) which, according to 2 Pet. i. 7, constitutes a specific form of the broader virtue of ἀγάπη was designated by the Lord Himself as a special characteristic of His disciples (Joh. xiii. 35. Also Tertullian paints in the liveliest colors its prevalence in the church of his time; and even the scoffer Lucian is obliged to pay an unwilling tribute to its power when he says (*de morte Peregrini*): "Their principal Law-giver has inspired in them the sentiment that they are all mutually brethren so soon as they had passed over, *i. e.*, had denied the Grecian Gods, and devoted themselves to the worship of that crucified sophist, and were living in accordance with his precepts." Moreover, Julian (epistle 49) says that "kindness toward strangers (ἡ περὶ τοὺς ξένους φιλανθρωπία) had been a principal means of propagating the ἀθεότης of the Christians.

VER. 2. **Forget not.**—Λανθάνω, with the participle, is a familiar Greek construction. The reference is to the experiences of Abraham and Lot (Gen. xviii. 19). Perhaps also to Matt. xxv. 44, 45. Substantially parallel are Rom. xii. 13; 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 8; 1 Pet. iv. 9. Whether ἔλαθον forms a paronomasia with ἐπιλανθάνεσθε (Lun.) is doubtful.

VER. 3. **As bound with them—as being yourselves also in the body.**—It is neither necessary nor admissible, in order to give to ὡς the same signification in both clauses, to understand, with Böhme, and others, *the bound with them*, of life and sufferings in the *ecclesia pressa*, ["travelling too far from the context."—ALF.], or, with Calvin, and others, to understand the "body" of the church as the *body of Christ*. We may, with Œc., give ὡς in the first clause, also the causal significance, which it unquestionably has in the second; but his translation, "inasmuch as we are closely connected with them," merely involves the idea that, by virtue of our membership and communion with our imprisoned brethren, we should feel ourselves under obligation to remember them in loving sympathy. It is more advisable, therefore, to take the first ὡς as a particle of comparison. ["As being yourselves also in the body," *i. e.*, as being yourselves in a body which exposes you to like suffering with them, and might therefore be expected to secure your sympathy for the sufferer.—K.].

VER. 4. **Marriage in all.**—In the New Testament γάμος means, elsewhere, the wedding and its celebration; here, as in classical Greek, *wedlock*. [Alf. takes it here as "wedding," and renders it "your marriage"]. Ἐν πᾶσιν means not *with all nations* (Pesh., Beza, Grot., and others, who, with τίμιος, erroneously supply ὅτι); but, "*in every respect, in all respects.*" Were the injunction intended to be that marriage should be held honorable with all persons. (Luth., *etc.*), or that no unmarried person should regard it with contempt (Böhme, Schultz, *etc.*), or that it should be forbidden to no man, the form would probably be παρὰ πᾶσιν.

VER. 5. **He himself has said.**—Not Christ (Bez., Böhm., Klee), but God, in the Scripture. These words are found in full, Deut. xxxi. 6, 8, and repeated, 1 Chron. xxviii. 20. But God is there spoken of in the third person. Individual elements of this consolatory address, representing God as speaking in the first person, are found, Gen. xxviii. 15; Josh. i. 5; Isa. xli. 17. It is found, in precisely the same terms as here, in PHILO, *Ed. Mang.*, I. 430. That the author has drawn immediately from PHILO, (Bl., De W.), is scarcely to be supposed. We may rather conjecture that the saying had in this form already become a proverb (Beng.), or that it originated in the liturgical and homiletical usage of the Hellenistic Synagogue from the confounding of kindred expressions with the original passage, Deut. xxxi. 6 (Del.). The double negation in the first, and the triple negation in the second member, serve for emphasis. The mention of the persecutions of the church, suggests the trustful declaration cited from Ps. cxviii. 6.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Brotherly love* stands preëminent among the distinguishing marks of the children of God (1 Jno. iii. 1), and if genuine, never ceases (1 Cor. xiii. 8). Its purity, power, and permanence, however, depend upon the nature of our relation

to Christ, and with this, upon that of our faith. It can therefore, on the one hand, never dispense with nourishment, culture and discipline; and on the other cannot do without exercise.

2. The practice of *hospitality* may very easily prove disagreeable; one may exercise it unwillingly, sullenly, and enviously; may limit it by caprice and selfishness; may regard and treat it as a burden and a plague. We must therefore be kindly reminded of this duty, as a *duty of love*, and learn to give heed to the *blessing* it brings with it, in order that the offerings which we are required to bring, and the privations which we impose upon ourselves, may not fall too heavily or incite us to self-glorification. And this blessing transcends *our knowledge* and conception. We may receive into our house *messengers of God;* nay, may receive Christ Himself, in His humblest servants (Matt. xxv. 35 ff.).

3. The connection, which, in a two-fold way, we have with sufferers, *viz.*, by *spiritual* and by *natural* ties of friendship, must make itself be recognized by compassionate and effective sympathy, in every individual case; and inasmuch as this is deficient, and often inconvenient, we are reminded, on the one hand, of the law in accordance with which, if one member suffers, all the members suffer with it (1 Cor. xii. 26); and on the other, of our own liability to suffer, a liability inseparable from our bodily life.

4. The character belonging to *marriage*, as an ordinance instituted and blessed of God, and the purity which, according to the will of God, befits the *marriage bed*, and the rites of matrimony, need special attention and care. "The terrible sentence pronounced on fornicators and adulterers is one which pays no heed to the false reasonings and cavilling interpretations, which will plead in excuse for such impurities the fierce lusts of man, the course of the world, and the difficulties of ordinary wedlock. At the judgment of God it will also be made manifest how much power and light the knowledge of God and of our Lord, Jesus Christ, have imparted to each one, by which to escape from this corruption of the world; nay, it will also become manifest that the majority have fallen, not from an irresistible power of their nature, but from lusts wilfully indulged, and nurtured and heightened by the reading of mischievous books, and by profligate intercourse; nay, that frequently they have themselves inflamed, and urged on anew the nature which had been wearied out in the service of sin, and had withdrawn from it with loathing. Then, too, it will become evident what evasions men have resorted to, in order to escape the judgments of men, and why many have so aided others, and how many a one has chosen rather to carry his lusts with him to the bar of God, than to free himself from them upon the dying-bed" (Rieger).

5. Pleasure and licentiousness lead not only to extravagance, but also to discontentment, thence to covetousness, and finally, not unfrequently to miserly niggardliness. Yet even apart from this, an insatiable and covetous habit of feeling and action stands in direct antagonism to the Christian temper and conduct (Matt. vi. 19–34; Col. iii. 5; Phil. iv. 11, 12; 1 Tim. vi. 6), and plunges one into severe temptations and great dangers (1 Tim. vi. 9 ff). An effective weapon against this, as against the fear of human wickedness and violence, is the use of the word of God, by which confidence in the living God, who has promised that He will withdraw from us neither His *presence*, nor His *help*, is awakened and nourished.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

What most *hinders*, and what most *promotes* the exercise of Christian love.—We have in suffering and assaults, not merely the *sympathy* of the *brethren*, but also the *comfort of the word of God*, and the *help of the Lord*.—Faith, the *mother* of all virtues.—The *characteristics* of true *Christianity*.—How, while living in the world and in the flesh, we conquer world and flesh.—We are either *judged* or *saved* of God; there is no alternative.

STARKE:—Love is a cardinal virtue, which embraces in itself all others (Rom. xiii. 10), and is a fruit of the Holy Spirit, in which faith becomes active (Gal. v. 6).—Brotherly love must not be love in words, but must evince itself in act, especially toward those who are, for the sake of the Gospel, imprisoned, or otherwise suffering persecution, so that we may extend to them counsel, aid and refreshment (1 John iii. 18).—It is a gracious provision of God that although the ungodly would gladly see all the righteous destroyed at once, or at least oppressed, still sufferings pass but gradually from one to another, in order that those who as yet have been spared, may be able to receive and succor the oppressed (Rev. xii. 12).—He who is prudent will let the consideration of the righteous judgment of God hold him back from sin (Eccles. xii. 13, 14).—Sin, the sin of fornication and adultery, cannot be too sharply rebuked before the world. Hence God has pledged Himself to punish them.—The little which a righteous man hath, is better than the great possessions of the ungodly.—A Christian must faithfully apply to himself what he reads in the Holy Scriptures, according to the exigencies of the case.—Human weakness fears before men, as if they could disturb its pleasant repose and satisfaction. But comfort! who shall be able to harm those whom God has taken into His protection? (Rom. viii. 31; 1 Pet. iii. 14).

RIEGER:—It belongs to the nature and power of faith to receive promptly and interpret for itself every word of God, but along with this to set to its seal, that God is true. He who makes God alone his goal, has in God a rich consolation.—This is the holiest feature of the book of the Psalms that in it the Divine promises are placed before us, transformed already into pure nourishment for faith, and into living power.

HAHN:—A guest has frequently an invisible companion, and thus the cost of his entertainment is richly repaid.—Worldlings leave one another in the lurch; but believers all stand firm for a man.—Brotherly love has two hinderances, the unchaste flesh, and avarice.—God makes a marvellous distribution of suffering: one suffers early, another late. Thus what has not yet arrived, may still come. Hence, both in prayer and in benefactions remember the miserable.—Man is always anxious lest his supplies may fail; but God is good for all our deficiencies.

SCHLEIERMACHER:—On Christian hospitality. (Sermons on the Christian household).

HEUBNER:—The dearer to us is our faith, the dearer to us are our kinsmen in the faith.—In Christianity purity has a *religious* ground.—Confidence in God is the best preservative against anxious care for food, and makes us free from the fear of men.

HEDINGER:—Love has extraordinary impulses; the best love gladly entertains guests. Whom? Those who are unable to render any temporal recompense.

B.

Special admonitions regarding their inclination to apostasy.

CHAPTER XIII. 7—17.

7 Remember them which have the rule over you [your leaders], who [as those who]
have spoken [spoke] unto you the word of God: whose faith follow, considering the
8 end of *their* conversation [contemplating the issue of their walk]. Jesus Christ [is]
9 the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. Be not carried about [aside, παραφέρεσθε][1]
with divers [various] and strange doctrines [teachings]; for *it is* a good thing [is good]
that the heart be established with grace; not with meats, which have not profited
10 them that have been occupied[2] therein. We have an altar, whereof [wherefrom] they
11 have no right to eat which [who] serve the tabernacle. For the bodies of those beasts
whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin,[3] are burned
12 without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his
13 own blood, suffered without the gate. Let us go forth, therefore, unto him without
14 the camp, bearing his reproach. For here we have no continuing city [have not here
15 an abiding city], but we seek one to come [are seeking that which is to come]. By
[Through] him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is,
the fruit of *our* [*om. our*] lips giving thanks [making acknowledgment] to his name.
16 But to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well
17 pleased. Obey them that have the rule over you [them that lead you, ver. 7], and
submit yourselves: for they watch for [are watching on behalf of] your souls,[4] as they
that must give [render] account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief
[sighing, στενάζοντες]; for that *is* unprofitable for [unto] you.

[1] Ver. 9.—Instead of περιφέρεσθε read παραφέρεσθε, after Sin. A. C. D., and the majority of minusc.

[2] Ver. 9.—Instead of περιπατήσαντες, Sin. A. D*., read περιπατοῦντες.. The former has been introduced into Sin. by a later hand.

[3] Ver. 11.—The words περὶ ἁμαρτίας, are wanting in A.; they stand in Sin. D. K., before εἰς τὰ ἅγια; in C*., after these words; and in 14, 47, they become περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν, for which reason they are regarded by some as an interpolated gloss.

[4] Ver. 17.—The authority of A. and Vulg., is not sufficient to warrant the removal of the words ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, and placing them after ἀποδώσοντες, where D*. again adds ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν.

[Ver. 7.—τῶν ἡγουμένων, *those who are* (or in this case, *were*) *leading you*, who, it appears from what follows, were now dead, and are to be remembered and followed in their Christian example. "Them that have the rule over you," of the E. V., therefore, is not strictly warrantable.—οἵτινες, characteristic, *of the kind who* (*the which*, Alf.).—ἐλάλησαν, not *have spoken*, but, *spoke*, historically—it is now over.—ἀναθεωροῦντες, *surveying back*, going backward in your contemplations over the entire series. Difficult to express by one word in English. "Considering," however, which does duty here as for so many other words, is needlessly inadequate. Better with Alf, "surveying." "Considering" which, marks a purely intellectual act, loses entirely the external imagery of ἀναθεωροῦντες. This is retained in "surveying," partially also in "contemplating." Moll, "hinschauend."—τῆς ἀναστροφῆς, *their conduct*, *walk* (E. V., conversation).

Ver. 8.—Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς, "not common with our writer; only elsewhere at ver. 21," (Alf.).—understand ἐστίν, *is*—εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, stands emphatic, "is yesterday and to-day the same—and forever."

Ver. 9.—μὴ παραφερεσθε, *be not carried aside*, not περιφ., "carried *about*"—the παραφ., much more forcible and pertinent to the author's purpose, as not referring to Christian instability in general, but to being borne away from Christianity itself.

Ver. 9.—ἐν οἷς, "in which they who walked, were not profited."

Ver. 10.—ἐξ οὗ, *from which*, *wherefrom*.—ἐξουσίαν, *right*, *authority*, *privilege*—rarely well rendered by *power*, as by E. V., as at John i. 13—τῇ σκηνῇ, Beng. (cited by Alf.), "*est aculeus quod dicit*, τῇ σκηνῇ *non* ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ."

Ver. 11.—ὧν ζώων, of what animals—*of those animals of which*.—περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτιας, *for sin*; Moll, though marking it doubtful in his critical note, retains it in his version. Alford rejects it.—διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, *through*, *by means of the high priest*, regarded as acting *for* the people, or for God.—κατακαίεται, *are burned up*, *consumed*; E. V., *are burned*, not quite adequately.—τῆς παρεμβολῆς, *the encampment* in the wilderness; the old tabernacle imagery carried through to the last.

Ver. 14.—*μένουσαν πόλιν, an abiding city.—τὴν μέλλουσαν ἐπιζητοῦμεν, we are seeking after* (*ἐπί*, direction toward hence implies yearning after, xi. 14), *that which is to be*—the *future* abiding city.

Ver. 15.—*ἀναφέρωμεν, let us be offering up.—καρπὸν χειλ., the fruit of lips* (fruit or offering rendered by lips) *making acknowledgment to his name.*

Ver. 17.—*τοῖς ἡγουμ., them that lead you, your leaders.—αὐτοὶ γάρ, for themselves*—they in turn, or on their part.—*ἀγρυπνοῦσι*, are *sleepless, keep vigilant watch*, the meaning stronger than is suggested by the simple English term *watch.—ὑπὲρ, on behalf of.—ὡς ἐπιδωσ., having, being destined, to render an account.—ἵνα τοῦτο ποιῶσιν, that they may be doing this,* viz., *watching.—στενάζοντες, sighing, groaning.* Moll, *seufzend; Alf., lamenting,* viz., "over your disobedience."—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 7. **Your leaders.**—The term *ἡγούμενος* which is found Acts xv. 22, with the Rom. Clem. (*ad* Cor. 1 and 37), and in the martyr St. Ignat. § 4 points to no other than the ordinary form of church government (Dav. Schultz). Chrys. explains the word, although at this time, it already had the special signification of *abbot*, by *ἐπίσκοποι*. Of kindred nature is the designation of the heads of the Church, 1 Thes. v. 12, by *προϊστάμενοι*.

Issue of their walk.—Ἔκβασις τῆς ἀναστροφῆς expresses not the *development*, (Œc., De Dieu), and not the *result* of the walk, in respect to others, (Braun, Cramer) or, in respect to the *perfected* ones themselves, in heaven (Storr, *etc.*), but, in the connection, their *death by martyrdom*.

Ver. 8. **Jesus Christ, yesterday.**—Inassuch as the subject is the God-man, we need not extend the *ἐχθές* (so read in Sin. A. C*. D*.) to the time before the appearance of Christ (Beng., *etc.*), and thus neither to the entire time of the Old Covenant, (Calv., *etc.*), nor at all to the preëxistence of Christ (Ambrose, Seb. Schmidt, *etc.*). Luther, following the Vulg. and Œc., falsely puts a stop after *σήμερον*. It is not the eternity (Ambrose, Cyrill. Alex., Calov., *etc.*), but the eternal *unchangeableness* of Christ on which emphasis is laid. Hence, *ὁ αὐτός* is the predicate applicable to all the three divisions of time. The sentence thus abruptly introduced, (without the usual connection) serves undoubtedly to assign a reason for the following warning, yet nothing authorizes the supposition that it stands in an intended antithesis to the Jewish expectation of a still future Messiah (Œc.). It is possible that it, at the same time, furnishes the ground for the preceding exhortation, (Bl. Ebr., *etc.*), or encourages to its fullfilment (Theoph., Grot., *etc.*). Nothing in the passage requires us to take it as explaining the substance of the faith of the *ἡγούμενοι* (Calov., Carpz.).

Ver. 9. **By various and strange teachings.**—The ordinances of the Old Testament itself (Wieseler, Lün., *etc.*), the author would hardly have thus designated, for they are regarded by him as divinely ordained shadows and types of essential and eternal objects and relations. We must refer the term to human doctrines, which attach themselves to these ordinances, and, as shown by the connecting particle *γάρ*, to such as referred specially to *βρώματα*. These are not sacrificial meals, as after Schlichting, Bl., Lün., and others suppose; but food, meats, (the old interpp., Böhme, Thol., Ebr., Del., Riehm, Alf.) in which were sought ritual means of justification, ch. ix. 10. [For the reasons (1) "that *βρώματα* is a word not found in the law when offerings are spoken of, but in the distinction of clean and unclean, Lev. xi. 34; 1 Macc. i. 63; (2) that in all New Testament places where *βρῶμα* is used in a similar connection, it applies to clean and unclean meats: (3) that *διδαχαῖς ποικίλαις—παραφερ.*, must refer not to meats eaten after sacrifice, but to such doctrines in which there was variety and perplexity, as to those concerning clean and unclean."—(Alf.)]. In the classics, also, *ξένος* does not always indicate something *foreign*, but sometimes, something strange and surprising. The antithesis in the two clauses is overlooked by Böhme, who, following Castalio, understands *χάρις* of gratitude to God, and by Bisping, who refers it to the Lord's Supper, as the Christian sacrificial meal [a "monstrous interpretation," Alf.].

Ver. 10. **We have an altar,** *etc.* *Θυσιαστήριον* is not Christ Himself, (Bugenhagen, Biesenthal, *etc.*) nor the table of the Lord's Supper (Böhm., Ebr. Bisp., *etc.*), nor an expiatory arrangement in general, (Michael., Stier, Thol., Hofm., *etc.*), but the *cross* upon Golgotha (Thom. Aquin., Este, Beng., Bl., De W., Lün., *etc.*), of which Christians eat, in that the atoning victim that was offered upon it, is the food of their souls (Riehm), comp. John vi. 51 ff. The question is not merely of the enjoyment of the spiritual blessings resulting to believers from the sacrificial death of Christ (Bl., Lün.), but communion with the *personal* Christ *crucified* on our behalf. The *τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες* are not Christians (Schlicht., Schultz, Hofm., *etc.*), but either as ch. ix. 9; x. 2 the *Israelites* (Lün., Kluge), or, as ch. viii. 5, the Jewish priests (Bl., De W., Del., Riehm), who, above others, had access to the typical dwelling-place of God, and had a right to partake of the food that had been consecrated to God.

Ver. 11. **For the bodies of those animals whose blood,** *etc.*—Of many sacrifices, the priests obtained either the entire flesh, Lev. v. 9; xxiii. 20; or the breast, and shoulder, Num. vii. 34; or the whole with the exception of the fat pieces, Num. iv. 26 ff.; comp. ch. vi. 19, 22; vii. 7. But of the *sin-offerings* whose blood was brought into the inner tabernacle, Lev. iv. 5–7; iv. 16–18, ch. xvi. the fat pieces were brought to the altar, and all the rest was consumed by fire without the camp. This burning was only a means of *getting rid* of the things burned, and was called שָׂרַף, a word never used to denote burning on the altar. The emphasis lies, therefore, not upon the burning, but on the fact that this mode of dealing with the flesh of the victims, from which the priests derived no enjoyment, took place without the camp. This is regarded by the author as typical. Lün., following Bähr, (*Stud. und Krit.*, 1849, iv. 936, ff.) regards the capital point of the argument of v. 10 as appearing in v. 12, and regards v. 11 as containing a preliminary idea that is merely auxiliary to the proof. But it is more natural to take v. 11 as containing the

proof of v. 10, while again, the idea of v. 12 is suggested by v. 11, and corresponds, therefore, in substance to v. 10 (Riehm). [The typical image is simple and forcible. Christ as a sin-offering, suffered without the gate whither the bodies of the animals that were slain as sin-offerings under the Old Covenant were carried to be burnt. As then the priests of the Old Covenant, and also the people, had no right to partake of that sacrifice, so they who now adhere to that Covenant, who minister to that tabernacle, have no right to partake of that great victim that is slain and disposed of outside of the encampment, and which is the antitype of the Old Testament sin-offering. In order to *eat* of this sacrifice, as Christ Himself requires, they must *break away* from their adherence to the system which *forbade* them to eat of the type, and can, therefore, of itself, give no authority to eat the antitype.—K.].

Ver. 13. **Wherefore let us go forth to Him**, *etc.*—This is an exhortation based on the preceding passage. It is not, however, an exhortation to refrain from sacrificial meats (Retschl.), or from worldly pleasures (Chrys., Primas., *etc.*); nor to a voluntary following into the sufferings of Christ (Œc., Limb., *etc.*); nor to a withdrawal from Jerusalem on account of its impending destruction (Clericus); but to a complete separation from Judaism, (Theod., Beng., Bl., Thol., Lün., *etc.*). To a willing endurance of exclusion from the Jewish Theocracy (Schlicht., Grot., *etc.*, and recently, Thiersch), there is not the slightest allusion; and the passage contradicts in the most decisive manner Schwegler's position, that to our Author Christianity is still in a transition state from Judaism.—It is only, [or rarely,] except in later writers and sometimes in the Sept., that τοίνυν stands, as here, at the beginning of the sentence. Does ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς involve a reference to the speedily following destruction of Jerusalem? At all events, the following verse could not but suggest to the mind of the readers, the city whose foundations are not moved, ch. xi. 10.

[It seems, by no means, improbable that this passage *does* have a double reference; that while its external and obvious import is to warn its readers to a complete withdrawal from the entanglements and bondage of Judaism, another import may have lain beneath its guarded language, *viz.*, a record by the Holy Spirit, through the inspired writer, of the warning and injunction formerly given by him to the Christians of Palestine, and especially of Jerusalem through the lips of the Lord. So interpreted, the terms have special significance. The τῆς παρεμβολῆς persistently kept up, still harmonizes with the primary and figurative import of the passage, while the οὐ μένουσαν πόλιν, in contrast with the τὴν ἐπιμέλλουσαν, shows that the writer has clearly in mind the earthly Jerusalem.—K.].

Ver. 15. **The sacrifice of praise.**—θυσία αἰνέσεως means, in the Old Testament, the *voluntary*, whether *promised* or *freely undertaken offering of praise* (thank-offering), זֶבַח תּוֹדָה, Num. vii. 12–15, which, however, even at Ps. l. 14, 23; cxvi. 17, is *a symbol* of the thanksgiving of the heart and mouth, and is here explained according to Hos. xiv. 8; yet after the LXX., that, instead of פָּרִים reads פְּרִי. Wetstein adduces the Rabbinical saying: "In the future all sufferings will cease; but the thank-offering ceases not;" and Philo (*ed. Mangey*, II. 258) styles this the best offering. According to a favorite Old Testament representation, thoughts are branches, and the words blossoms and fruits, which, taking root in the Spirit, and by him impelled through mouth and lips, sprout forth and ripen (Del., *Bibl. Psychologie*, p. 142). The last αὐτοῦ is not to be referred to Christ (Sykes), but to God.

Ver. 16. **But to do good and to communicate**, *etc.*—The Subst. εὐποιΐα is found in the New Testament only here. The *verb*, Mark xiv. 7. Κοινωνία in the same sense as here, Rom. xv. 26; 2 Cor. ix. 13; Phil. i. 5, of evincing our fellowship in communicating of our temporal possessions. Εὐαρεστοῦμαί τινι=*to be satisfied with any thing*, is entirely classical. Theophyl., Schlicht., Beng., *etc.*, erroneously refer τοιαύταις γάρ to ver. 15, also.

Ver. 17. **Unprofitable.**—Either as hindering the influence of the readers (Bl.), or as rendering them dispirited and inactive (Calv., Grot.), or best, per μείωσιν (Gerh., Thol., Lün.). The leaders must have been esteemed by the author as reliable men, and been known by him in their most favorable aspects. The first τοῦτο in ver. 17 refers to ἀγρυπνεῖν, the second to στενάζειν.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Examples worthy of imitation* are furnished specially by those leaders in the churches, and publishers of the Gospel, who, by the grace of God in Christ, were able to give such an expression to the faith which they have professed and taught, that their *dying corresponded with their life*, and their *death proved a living voucher of their faith*. The memory of these should be held in honor, and exercises a blessed influence on all who behold it.

2. Exalted above all change in fortune and in feeling, as above all personal vicissitudes, is Jesus Christ, the unchangeable and abiding *Head of the Church*, whether its members are already in heaven, or are still living upon the earth; and by virtue of His relation to God, He intercedes for, protects, blesses, and rules it eternally.

3. With the *pure word*, and the *all-sufficient* grace of God is given to us all that we need. To this there need, and should be added nothing drawn from other religions. Instead of producing steadfastness and satisfaction of heart, such a *mixture of foreign elements*, would rather disturb and weaken the purity, certainty, joy, and power of faith, and would bring with it the danger of a turning away, to unfruitful and perplexing ordinances, usages, and strifes.

4. Inasmuch as we have the only valid and efficient *expiatory offering* in Christ, who *outside* of the city of legal worship, was crucified for us, and have in him at the same time, the true Passover (1 Cor. vi. 8), we are enabled to partake of an *atoning banquet* which to the Levitical

priests was made legally impossible. It becomes therefore the duty of Christian churches that are still entangled in Judaism, *entirely* to abandon the Jewish camp.

6. On the basis of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which admits no repetition, and sets aside the whole system of sacrificial worship, we are alike laid under the obligation, and endowed with the capacity of offering acceptable and permanent sacrifices of *thanksgiving* and of *well doing*, with which we *praise God*, who, rich in grace, glorifies himself in sinners, and we *serve* one another according to the will of God as good stewards of the manifold gifts of God.

7. The prosperity of the church is best promoted when its leaders, mindful of their great responsibility before God, watch on behalf of souls, and the members of the church facilitate the fulfilment of this duty by *docility* and *obedience*, and render it fruitful of benefit to themselves.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The blessing of faithful teachers *before* and *after* their departure.—We owe to pious ancestors a *grateful remembrance* and *faithful imitation.*—How our departure from the world becomes an *entrance* into heaven, and a *precedent* for a following and imitation that is acceptable to God.—A *firm heart* is a *precious* thing and a *rare* treasure; but it is a *work of grace* and an *abiding* good.—What *comfort* lies in the fact that Jesus Christ is *always the same;* and in like manner, what *warning* and what *encouragement!* How the *cross* which *separates* us from the world, *unites* us with *God* and with *one another.*—The *offerings* of Christians are, 1. *prayer;* 2. *well doing;* 3. *obedience.*—What we have to *bring* to the altar, and what we have to *take* from it.

STARKE:—The teachers of the church, are leaders, conductors, guides; they must therefore so point the way to blessedness, as themselves to lead the way therein, and conduct their hearers to blessedness, not only with their doctrine, but also by their life and example (Phil. iii. 17; 1 Pet. v. 8).—It is one of the hidden ways of God that upright teachers of whom there are so few, and to whose preparation so much belongs, are removed by an early death. Disciples who have such teachers should follow them faithfully betimes, and hold them as all the dearer and more worthy (1 Thess. v. 12, 13; Isa. lvii. 1. 2).—Righteous, faithful teachers shine in life and in death. Happy they who dwell in memory, upon their holy walk, and edifying death, and thus secure their own preparation for a future blessed departure (Matt. v. 14 ff.). The world frequently forms erroneous judgments of this or that man; but his death testifies of his faith and life; so that many are obliged to wonder and acknowledge that he was a pious man (Luke xxiii. 4, 7).—Doctrine and grace belong together; pure doctrine, and the grace, causing by means of it, that the heart become established.—We eat Christ spiritually in faith (John vi. 35), and sacramentally in the Holy Supper (Matt. xxvi. 26).—Would we have part in Christ and be sanctified by Him, we must renounce this world and bear His reproach.—The confession and the reproach of Christ are fellow-travellers.—Reproach is a proof whereby God tests the softness and humility of the heart.—For the sake of the truth of the gospel, we must give up land, city, house, goods, and all (Matt. xix. 29).—If thy praise is to please God He must Himself produce it within thee (Phil. i. 11).—Christians also are under obligations to sacrifice, yet not a Mass, but a sacrifice of praise, and themselves (Rom. xii. 1). With this God in His grace, allows Himself to be well pleased.—No hour of the morning is too early, no noon too high, no evening too late, no day too hot, no night too dark, no place too solitary—thou canst always praise God (Ps. iv. 2, 9; cxix. 55). The praise of God belongs properly to the heart; yet must at certain times, also employ the body with its members, particularly the mouth (Ps. xxxiv. 2).—Faith makes us willingly and readily serve and suffer, for the love and praise of God.—It is the mark of a righteous teacher, when he best satisfies himself in reaping the fruits of his office in the heart of his hearers.

RIEGER:—Jesus Christ has an honor and glory which He can share with no other. The Cross of Jesus ever frees us more and more from all that is upon earth, from all that would establish itself in the love of our hearts, and would weigh down the upward tendency *of* our spirit; and draws us with our love, regard and hope, away thither where Jesus has entered on our behalf.—Let no hour pass without praise and love.—One of the two things must weigh upon us, either duty now, or conscience hereafter.

HEUBNER:—If the world were our eternal dwelling-place, and to remain among the people of the world were our everlasting destiny, it would be hard to bear reproach; but we have here but a brief sojourn.—God, Himself, must work in us, through Christ, the fruits which shall please Him.—To load ourselves with the sighs of the pious, robs us of bliss.

AHLFELD:—Confirmation is a sacred act, by which the child is to be established in its baptismal covenant. The obligations which it imposes 1. on the servants of the church, 2. on those to be confirmed, 3. on the church, in particular, the parents and god-parents of the child.

MOLENAAR:—(*New-Year's Sermon*, Ohly, 1863, III. 1). Jesus Christ, the same yesterday and today, and the same also forever. We ponder this, 1, for our consolation, and for our quiet, since also in this year Jesus is the same, *a* in His Word, as our Teacher and Prophet; *b.* in His grace, as our Mediator and High-Priest; *c.* in His power, as our King and Lord; 2. for instruction and warning; *a.* for unbelievers; *b.* for believers.

HEDINGER;—Grace must confirm the wavering reed.—To waver is already to have half fallen; but to fall from grace is worse than never to have been therein.

C.

Personal communications.

Chapter XIII. 18–25.

18 **Pray for us: for we trust[1] [persuade ourselves] we have a good conscience, in all**
19 **things willing to live honestly [wishing to conduct ourselves honorably]: But [And]**
I beseech *you* the rather [the more abundantly beseech you] to do this, that I may be
20 **restored to you the sooner. Now [And] the God of peace, that brought again [back]**
from the dead our Lord Jesus, that [the] great Shepherd of the sheep, through [in]
21 **the blood of the [an] everlasting covenant, Make you perfect in every good work[2]**
[in order] to do his will, working in you [himself][3] that which is well pleasing in his
22 **sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom *be* glory forever and ever.[4] Amen. And I be-**
23 **seech you, brethren, suffer [bear with][5] the word of exhortation: for I have written a**
letter unto you in few words. Know ye that *our*[6] brother Timothy is set at liberty;
24 **with whom, if he come shortly, I will [shall] see you. Salute all them that have the**
25 **rule over you, and all the saints. They of Italy salute you. Grace *be* with you all.**
Amen.[7]

[1] Ver. 18.—Instead of *πεποίθαμεν*, *trust*, we are to read with A. C*. D*. D., lat., 17, 53, *πειθόμεθα*. In Sin., also, *πεποίθαμεν*, is introduced as a correction.
[2] Ver. 21.—The addition *καὶ λόγῳ* after *ἔργῳ*, in A., is a gloss from 2 Thess. ii. 17.
[3] Ver. 21.—The *αὐτός*, *self*, with Lachm. ed. ster., rests only on D. lat. and 71; Wetstein also ascribes it to C., but erroneously. In his large ed. Lachm. reads *αὐτῷ* after A. C*., and Greg. Nyss. This reading is also found in Sin., but rejected by the corrector.
[4] Ver. 21.—C***. D. and many minusc. omit *τῶν αἰώνων*.
[5] Ver. 22.—The Imperf. *ἀνέχεσθε* is supported by Sin. A. C. D***. K., against the Infin. *ἀνέχεσθαι*, found in D*., 46, 57, Vulg., Pesh., Arm.
[6] Ver. 23.—The *ἡμῶν* is to be received after Sin. A. C. D*., 17, 31, 37, 39. In the Sin. it has been thrown out by the corrector.
[7] Ver. 25.—'Αμήν is found in Sin. only as a correction.

[Ver. 18.—*πειθόμεθα, we persuade ourselves;* Moll, *wir sind der Ueberzeugung*, we are of the conviction; Alf., *we are persuaded*. Rec. *πεποίθαμεν, we trust.* Πεπείσμεθα is elsewhere rendered, *we are persuaded*, vi. 9.—*ἀναστρέφεσθαι, to conduct ourselves.*

Ver. 19.—*περισσοτέρως δέ, and I the more abundantly beseech you.* The Eng. ver. weakly renders *rather*, which it seems to attach to *ποιῆσαι*. The Rec. ver., and Alf. both improperly render *δέ* adversatively *but*. The German *aber*, thrown in after several introductory words, is less objectionable. The adversative force of *δέ* is often, as here, too slight to admit of its being indicated in English.

Ver. 20.—'Ο *δὲ θεὸς, and the God:* Eng. ver., *now the God;* Alf., *but the God.*—*ὁ ἀγαγών, who brought back*; or, perhaps, as Moll, Alf., *etc.*, *who brought up*. I prefer the former, and *back* to *again*.—*τὸν μέγαν ποιμ., the* (not, *that*) *great shepherd.*—*ἐν αἵματι, in* (not *by*) *the blood*, refers to *ἀγαγών*—*διαθήκης αἰων., of an* (not *the*) *everlasting covenant.*

Ver. 22.—*παρακαλῶ δέ, and I beseech*, not, *but I beseech.*—*ἀνέχεσθε, bear with.*—*ἔγραψα, I wrote:* "the epistolary Aor., *mandabam*, *ἔγραψα* frequently in St. Paul" (Alf.).

Ver. 23.—*γινώσκετε*, not so clearly indicated as imperative, by standing at the beginning of the sentence, as Alf., Moll, *etc*, deem. Its position rather determines the emphasis; and it is by no means certain that the Indic. form might not be quite as emphatic as the Imper. Bl., De W., *etc.*, take it as Indic. We can hardly decide positively.—*ἀπολελυμένον*, taken predicatively, the Part. for Inf., with verbs of *knowing*, *etc.;* also undoubtedly *released*, not *dispatched*.—K.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 18. **Pray for us.**—In the same way as Paul (Rom. xv. 30; Eph. vi. 19; Col. iv. 3; 1 Thess. v. 25; 2 Thess. iii. 1), the author now begs the prayers of the church on his own behalf, and appeals, against the suspicion of his enemies, to the testimony of his good conscience, as Paul, 2 Cor. i. 12. Many, as recently Feilmoser and Bisping, assume for this reason, and because in the following verses the style seems more than hitherto to resemble that of Paul, that Paul has accompanied the letter of a pupil and confidential fellow-laborer, with this brief postscript, and thus adopted as his own the entire epistle. Others regard the plural *περὶ ἡμῶν* as embracing still other persons than the "author," either Timothy (Seb. Schmidt, *etc.*), or the "leaders" mentioned, v. 17 (Carpz.), or the co-workers who with the author are announcing the Gospel in heathen countries remote from the Hebrew Christians.

We persuade ourselves, *etc.*—The *πεποίθαμεν* of the *lect. rec.*=*we have confidence, or trust*, Beng., Böhme, *etc.*, take absolutely, and then regard *ὅτι* as *causal* ("because"). According to the true reading *πειθόμεθα*, the author says [and substantially the same meaning might be educed with the reading *πεποίθαμεν*]; We persuade ourselves, *i. e.*, we hold it as matter of conviction that, *etc.* He assigns a reason for his claim to their prayers, and expresses himself modestly on account of his relation to the readers. The parti-

cipial clause following, is by some connected with πειθόμεθα assigning the *ground* on which he rests his persuasion; by others better with ἔχομεν thus stating the thing to which his conscience bears testimony. 'Ἐν πᾶσιν belongs not to ἔχομεν (Œc. Theophyl.), and is not masc. (Chrys., Luth., Thol., *etc.*)

VER. 19. **And I the more abundantly beseech you,** *etc.*—Περισσοτέρως is connected by Seb. Schmidt, Ramb., Beng., with ποιῆσαι; by Lün., and the majority with παρακαλῶ; by Del. with both. Calov. and others have without reason inferred from this an imprisonment of the author. For although ἀποκαθιστάνειν τινά τινι points naturally to the removal of some serious hinderance, yet it by no means necessarily refers to the specific idea of *imprisonment.* Nor do the words shed any light on the specific relation which the author has previously sustained to the church in question.

VER. 20. **And may the God of peace,** *etc.*—This expression which is also familiar to Paul, is referred by many with Chrys., to a discordant relation between the author and his readers, which they conceive to be indicated in v. 18; by Grot., Böhm., De W., Bisp., and others to dissensions among the readers, alluded to ch. xii. 14; by Schlicht. and Riehm, to Paul's mode of designating God as the dispenser of salvation. The words ἐν αἵματι αἰωνίου διαθήκης, and by Œc., Calv., Beng., Bl., Bisp., *etc.*, connected with ὁ ἀναγαγών; by Baumgart. and others with μέγαν; but better by Bez., Grot., Este, Lün., Riehm, *etc.*, are taken instrumentally as more exactly defining the collective clause τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν. could we refer the ἀναγαγών to the *ascension* (Bl., De W., Bisp.), we might easily take ἐν in the sense of *accompaniment* as ch. ix. 25 (Calv., Bl., Bisp., V. Gerlach, Kahnis). But the words ἐκ νεκρῶν restrict the participle to the *resurrection,* the distinct mention of which in our epistle is confined to this single passage. ["This is the only place where our author mentions the resurrection. Every where else he lifts his eyes from the depth of our Lord's humiliation, passing over all that is intermediate, to the highest point of His exaltation. The connection here suggests to him once at least to make mention of that which lay between Golgotha and the throne of God, between the altar of the cross and the heavenly sanctuary, the resurrection of Him who died as our sin-offering," Del., cited by Alf.]. Perhaps the author had Is. lxiii. 11, or also Zech. ix. 11, floating before his mind. The *Doxology* is less naturally referred to the very *remote* ὁ Θεός as being the principal subject of the sentence, (Limb., Beng., Chr. F. Schmidt, Del., Alf., *etc*). than to the immediately preceding 'Ιησοῦ χριστοῦ (Calv., Grot., Bl., Thol., Lün. and the majority).

VER. 22. **In few words.**—The expression διὰ βραχέων=δι' ὀλίγων, 1 Pet. v. 12, furnishes no reason for referring the λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως barely to the exhortations interspersed through the Epistle (Dind., Kuin.), or barely to the section from ch. x. 19 (Grot., Calov, *etc.*), or exclusively to the last chapter (Semler). Theophyl. rightly places the brevity of the Epistle in contrast with the fulness of thought and emotion which swells the breast of the writer who stood in no official relation to the readers, and employs the gentlest and tenderest forms of speech when he comes to speak in his own person. 'Ἐπιστέλλειν=writing a letter, as Acts xv. 20; xxi. 20.

VER. 23. **Know that Timothy,** *etc.*—There is no reason for taking γινώσκετε as Indic. (Vatabl., Bl., De W., *etc.*); and the absence of the article before ἀπολελυμένον is decisive against the rendering of Schultz=ye know our brother Timothy, the one who has been *set free,* as well as against the rendering of Storr, *etc.:* Hold in honor, or Receive kindly. The interpretation of ἀπολελυμένον, *absent from, viz., the author* (Este., Limb., Carpz., *etc.*), is forced and unnatural. The translation, *sent away, viz.*, with the letter to the Hebrews (Theod., *etc.*), is possible (Acts xiii. 3; xv. 30, 33; xix. 41; xxiii. 22); and to this explanation of the participle conforms the subscription of the Epistle in many minusc. and ancient versions: 'Ἐγράφη ἀπὸ 'Ιταλίας διὰ Τιμοθέου. The old interpreters, Chrys., Theoph., Œc., refer it, although hesitatingly, to a being freed from imprisonment. Since Beza, this has been decidedly the prevalent view.

VER. 24. **Salute all,** *etc.*—We cannot infer from this passage either that the Epistle was directed to a plurality of churches, or to mere private persons. Large churches had a number of leaders, and these must receive the salutation without exception, and so also the entire Church in all its members. May it perhaps also include all Christians with whom the receivers of the Epistle come into contact, independently of a connection with the Church? (Del.).

They of Italy.—Since Semler, the majority of expositors have assumed that the οἱ ἀπὸ 'Ιταλίας must have designated persons who had come from Italy, and were with the author outside of the limits of that country. They have been supposed in particular to be fugitives from the persecution under Nero; sometimes, however, simply, in general, Italian fellow-laborers with the author, perhaps in Corinth or Ephesus (Bl.), or in Asia Minor (Schwegler), or in a place where no Christian Church as yet existed (Lün.), which latter supposition would explain the absence of any greeting addressed to the Church. Cod. 66 names Athens, but adds ἄλλοι δὲ ἀπὸ 'Ιταλίας. Special emphasis is laid upon the fact that the author, if he, while living in Italy, were conveying greetings from Italian Christians, would certainly have written οἱ ἐν 'Ιταλίᾳ (1 Tim. i. 15; 1 Pet. v. 13); but we might explain the expression of our Epistle from an elliptical mode of expressing relations of place according to (Matth. xxiv. 17; Luke xi. 13; xvi. 26); as=οἱ ἐν τῇ 'Ιταλίᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς 'Ιταλίας, as formerly Winer, but see, on the other hand, ALEX. BUTT. *Gramm. of the New Test. dialect,* p. 323); and not only so, but many with Thol., Wieseler, Del., maintain that ἀπό as well as ἐκ is used to express paraphrastically independent substantive ideas, so that the expression in question merely indicates that the persons sending their greetings *originated* from Italy, without intimating any thing with regard to their present residence. We may not, therefore, either, from this expression, deduce with certainty that the Epistle was written in Italy

(Cod. K. and other Greek MSS. and versions with Tisch., *Nov. Test.*, ed. 7. 11,596) or even that it must have been written in Rome (with Primas. and the ancients generally, as also Cod. A.)—The closing benediction is precisely identical with Titus iii. 15.—It may, however, be argued for the writing of the Epistle in Southern Italy (Wetstein) that Christian churches already existed, Acts xxviii. 13 (Thol.), and that Timothy, who apparently was in a different place from the author of our Epistle, and yet not far removed from him, could probably at this time have been imprisoned nowhere else than in Rome (Wieseler).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. From the *endeavor*, in all our relations, to walk in the right way, in the right manner, we are permitted to derive the *assurance* of a good conscience. Such an assurance we are all permitted to express, and to find in this moral condition a commendation which draws us all the nearer into the love and sympathy of Christian friends, that we may become especially valuable to them, and awaken, quicken, and strengthen the desire for closer communion, and for personal intercourse.

2. We need *prayer* on our behalf, not merely in weakness, and under assaults, but also for the fulfilment of our hopes and wishes in the attestations of our joy, and our gratitude for the living and powerful exhibition of our faith, of our love, of our communion in the Lord. This sense of need we must not repress, but cherish, give utterance to, and satisfy.

3. The best thing that we can wish and pray for one another is the continuance of the *work of God* in ourselves, in order that through Jesus Christ we may attain to *perfection of life* in God.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

True Christians need, demand and render *mutual intercourse* on behalf of each other.—The value *of a good conscience* in difficult situations in life.—The *greatness* of Jesus, as the *Shepherd* of the fold of God, mirrors itself 1. in the *greatness* of the *sacrifice* by which He became Shepherd of this flock; 2. in the *extent of the flock* which He has to *gather* and to *feed;* 3. in the *exaltedness of the position* to which He has been elevated.—The *new* covenant is an *eternal* covenant, because 1. it has been concluded by the eternal *Mediator;* 2. it is stamped with eternal *validity*, and 3. it imparts eternal *blessings*.

Starke:—A good conscience is a great comfort, and gives us a good confidence before God and men: before God, to whom we are permitted filially to turn in all need and anxiety; before men, that we need not be shamefaced, but may be able to encounter with joyfulness the eyes of every man.—The standard of good works is not men's self-will, but God's will. This will believers must not only know, but also do.—God works both the willing and the accomplishing; therefore, we must, by all means, give ourselves up to Him for spiritual renewal.—Teachers must respect highly their fellow-laborers in the gospel of Christ, and desire for them the like blessings as for themselves.—We should, indeed, bless even our enemies, but greet preëminently those who are the friends of God, and our friends.

Rieger:—From the dealings of God with His saints, we shall observe how wonderfully He brings them out of suffering, how wonderfully He conducts them into it.

Heubner:—The grace of God, the highest wish for ourselves and others (Ps. cvi. 4). Lord, remember me according to Thy grace, which Thou hast promised to Thy people. Amen!

THE END.